CONTENTS.

I.—THE APOCRYPHAL[1] SIR THOMAS MORE AND THE SHAKESPEARE HOLOGRAPH.

I.

The recent Tercentenary Commemoration of Shakespeare's death has brought forth at least two important works that lay claim to the immediate attention of critics and scholars. The one is a monumental collaboration of thirty-nine expert antiquaries who, under the direction of Sir Sidney Lee, undertook to reconstruct the daily life and interests of the English people during the life-time of the poet. Shakespeare's England[2] contains forty-nine chapters, each written by an acknowledged authority. Sir Walter Raleigh sketches the Elizabethan Age, Dr. Bradley writes on Shakespeare's English, Sir John Sandys on the Education and Scholarship of the times. The section devoted to Handwriting, by Sir Edward Maunde Thompson, pp. 284–310, has in turn given birth to the other work of consequence, Shakespeare's Handwriting.[3] In this study the ingenious theory of the late Richard Simpson, to the effect that in the well-known addition to the manuscript play of Sir Thomas More, extant in the Harleian MS. 7368 of the British Museum,

---

[1] " The epithet ' pseudo-Shakespearean ' no longer carries with it any presumption as to Shakespeare's authorship. Certain plays, a baker's dozen in all, have acquired a prescriptive right to the title, and must be mentioned in every list."—C. F. T. Brooke, The Shakespeare Apocrypha, Oxford, 1908, p. vii.

[2] 2 vols., Oxford, 1916.

[3] 4to, pp. xii, 64, Oxford, 1916.

16

we have a specimen of Shakespeare's autograph composition, receives what is intended to be the final and definitive confirmation. Sir E. M. Thompson's monograph, however, is a strictly diplomatic study, and does not take into account that, in this case at least, criticism of a literary nature cannot, to any extent, be eschewed, because the penmanship of the manuscript folios is inextricably bound up with the workmanship of the scenes which they embrace. A new investigation of the entire question has therefore been undertaken in these pages, which aims not only at a control—and amplification—of the palaeographical evidences adducible from the manuscript leaves but also at a reasonable comprehensiveness of the literary material in question.[1]

Sir Thomas More, in the transmitted form, consists of the original wrapper,—which constitutes folios 1 and 2,—of thirteen original leaves, fols. 3-5, 10, 11, 14, 15, 17-22,—which comprise about two-thirds of the whole,—of seven additional folios, 6-9, 12, 13, 16, and, since 1910, when W. W. Greg was permitted to detach the two cancelling slips of paper from fols. 11[b] and 14[a], of two more folios, 11[*] and 13[*]. Folios 6[b], 9[b], 11[*a], 13[*b] and 22[b] being blank, the actual number of manuscript pages is thirty-nine.[2]

They were not issued until 1844, when A. Dyce transcribed and published the play in behalf of the Shakespeare Society.[3]

---

[1] After the completion of the investigation the writer conferred with Dr. S. A. Tannenbaum, the genial psychanalyst and Shakespeare scholar, of New York. Some of his suggestions are here incorporated under the index (S. A. T.).

[2] The present description is made on the basis of a full-sized photographic facsimile of the manuscript, The Book of Sir Thomas Moore <Harleian MSS. 7368, c. 1590-96>, London. Issued for subscribers by the Editor of the Tudor Facsimile Texts (John S. Farmer), 1910, vi p. facs.: 38p. 39x26 cm. (Library of Congress press-mark, PR 2750, B 68, 1910.) There exists also a Students' reprint of the latter, by John S. Farmer, pub. Amersham, England, 1914. 38p. 34½ cm. Comparison was naturally made with the account by W. W. Greg in The Book of Sir Thomas More, The Malone Society Reprints, 1911, which contains facsimiles of fols. 3[a], 6[a], 7[a], 9[a], 12[a], 13[b] and 22[a]. By a strange oversight Dr. Greg has omitted mention of fols. 22[a] and 22[b] on p. xxvii of his schematic analysis. The best reproduction of fols. 8[a], 8[b] and 9[a] is to be found in Thompson's Shakespeare's Handwriting, pp. 32 ff.

[3] No. 23, pp. xxiii, 3, 102.

Nine years later this edition was reprinted by Thomas Amyot.[1] Hopkinson's modernized edition, London, 1902, intended for private circulation, is not generally accessible, but the division of the play into acts and scenes, first indicated by him, has been retained by C. F. Tucker Brooke in his edition.[2] The student of Sir Thomas More, however, will find himself in a totally helpless condition when endeavoring to make use of this book in conjunction with W. W. Greg's The Book of Sir Thomas More,[3]—for, while the former is divided according to Hopkinson's system, and represents a compromise between the original and the revised text, the latter prints, in the transmitted form, all of the original leaves first, with the lines in consecutive numbering, and then the additions by themselves, as they occur in the manuscript, the entire play being divided into scenes and not into acts as well. For the convenience of investigators, a comparative tabulation of the two systems on the basis of the folio-notation, such as is attached to the present study, Table I (p. 233), will be found to be indispensable.[4]

The manuscript is shot thru with alterations and deletions,— whole scenes have been marked for omission, misplaced or rewritten,—and, what is most important, it shows distinct evidence of the collaboration of several hands, both in the calligraphic and in the literary sense. Such composite authorship is not infrequent in the Elizabethan drama. Thus, for instance, the abbreviated names of five different writers are appended to the five acts of the printed text of The Tragedy of Tancred and Gismund, 1591/2,[5] viz. Rod. Staf(ford), Hen. No(el), G. Al., Ch. Hat(ton) and R. Wil(mot), the whole being revised by the last-named dramatist, as we are quaintly advised on the title-page, in accordance with " the decorum of these daies". MSS. Lansdowne 786 and Hargrave 205 of the

---

[1] A Supplement to Dodsley's Old Plays, v. 3, London, 1853.

[2] The Shakespeare Apocrypha, Oxford, 1908, pp. 385-437.

[3] Malone Society Reprints, London, 1911.

[4] We follow Greg's division, but not his views on the authorship and extent of the additions. Similarly must we register our disapprobation of Dr. Greg's contemptuous reference, p. xxv, to Tucker Brooke's introduction, which is reasonably accurate, and eminently satisfactory for the general reader it was intended to reach.

[5] Malone Society Reprints, 1914.

play give no indication to this effect. Henslowe's Diary [1] is a good source for such information. But for the item of 16 Oct 99 to the effect that Anthony Munday, Michael Drayton, Robert Wilson and Thomas Hathaway received payment for The Life of Sir John Oldcastle, we might be persuaded to lend credence to the late and spurious note on the edition of 1600 which makes Shakespeare the original author. The custom of joint-authorship permitted more than even four persons collaborating upon a single piece. Henslowe, for 22 May 1602, lists five men, Dekker, Drayton, Middleton, Munday and Webster, as joint authors of Caesar's Fall, and the same men for the same year are responsible also for The Two Harpies. There is, then, nothing unusual in the composite workmanship of Sir Thomas More, the aim having been, no doubt, to prepare the play for the stage with a maximum of despatch.

This point is best brought out in the discussion of the varied types of handwriting found in the manuscript. One of the hands, clearly that of the Master of the Revels, ' E^d Tyllney ', (so signed),[2] met with not only in marginal directions but also on the first leaf of the play, records his objection to the Insurrection Scene, which must have sounded seditious and inappropriate to his ears, " Leaue out ye Insurrection wholy & ye Cause ther off." Brooke maintains [3] that the play was submitted to Sir Edmund Tilney in the original form of thirteen leaves, and that the number of hands concerned in the work and the consequent disorder therein are due to the haste of the manager, anxious to stage his play in order to comply with the demands of the censor. This interpretation in itself, would be no exaggeration of the evidence. Another play may here be submitted which might form an exact parallel to such a view of Sir Thomas More. The Second Maiden's Tragedy [4] was

---

[1] Shakespeare Society, vol. 7, 1854. Cf. also the very serviceable Commentary to the Diary, by Dr. Greg, II, London, 1908.

[2] The form given by Dr. Greg, p. 1, as ' E Tyllney ' does not correspond with the manuscript.

[3] Op. cit. Introd. p. xlix.

[4] Malone Society Reprints, 1909. Also, Dodsley's Old English Plays, ed. Hazlitt, v. X. The verso of the last leaf, MS. Lansdowne 807, sets down for the author, successively, Thomas Goff, George Chapman and ' By Will Shaksper '. Cf. also Modern Language Notes, xxvii, pp. 33 ff.

TABLE I

An analysis of Sir Thomas More on the basis of folio notation, show-
ing a comparison between the scene division of Greg and
the act division of Henderson and Brooke.

GREG			BROOKE		
Folio	Line	Scene	Act	Scene	Line
3ᵃ, 3ᵇ	1-103	1	I	1	1-177
3ᵇ, 4ᵃ, 4ᵇ	104-312	2		2	1-207
5ᵃ, 5ᵇ	314-409	3		3	1-94
5ᵇ	410-452	4	(First sketch of II, 2, omitted by		
			Dyce, Henderson and Brooke)		
5ᵇ	453-472*	5	II	1	1-30
(Addition I)					
6ᵃ	1-71	13	Appendix, later draft of IV, 5, 68		
		(cf. fol. 19ᵃ)			
(Addition II)					
7ᵃ	1-65**	4		2	1-85
		(cf. fol. 5ᵇ)			
7ᵇ	66-120˅	5ᵃ		3	1-52
8ᵃ, 8ᵇ, 9ᵃ	121-270&	6		4	1-172
10ᵃ, 10ᵇ	473-565	6		4	173-273
10ᵇ, 11ᵃ, 11ᵇ	566-734	7	III	1	1-180
11ᵇ	735-796 >	8ᵃ	Appendix, first draft of III, 2, 23		
(Addition III)					
11*ᵇ	1-22	8		2	1-21
(Addition IV)					
12ᵃ and b, 13ᵃ and b	1-242 <	8		2	22-322
(Addition V)					
13*ᵃ	1-26˜	8ᵃ		3	1-22
14ᵃ	797-876	8ᵇ	Appendix, first draft of III, 2, 91		
14ᵇ, 15ᵃ, 15ᵇ	878-1118	9	IV	1	1-257
(Addition VI)*					
16ᵃ, 16ᵇ	1-73	9ᵃ			
Of this 1-20				1	310-329
21-35			Appendix, first draft of IV, 1, 330		
36-67				1	330-368
68-73			Not printed by Dyce and Brooke		
17ᵃ	1119-1158	9		1	258-309
17ᵃ, 17ᵇ, 18ᵃ	1159-1281	10		2	1-119
18ᵃ, 18ᵇ	1282-1379	11		3	1-95
18ᵇ	1380-1410	12		4	1-29
18ᵇ, 19ᵃ and b, 20ᵃ	1411-1602	13**		5	1-189
		(cf. fol. 6ᵃ)			
20ᵃ	1603-1674	14	V	1	1-69
20ᵇ	1675-1727	15		2	1-67
20ᵇ, 21ᵃ, 21ᵇ	1728-1860	16		3	1-134
21ᵇ, 22ᵃ	1861-1987	17		4	1-138
Of this 1956-64			Appendix, first draft of V, 4, 115		

FOOTNOTES:—*Marked for cancelling. **Elaboration of sc. 4 on fol. 5ᵇ. ˅Revi-
sion of a lost portion of sc. 5. &Revision of an original, part of which is lines 476-565
on fol. 10, so that ll. 473-5 being marked for omission, l. 476 follows upon l. 370.
>Lines 761-796 until lately covered by fol. 11ᵃ. <Marked to replace sc. 8ᵃ on 11*ᵇ.
From l. 212 on a different hand. Brooke, l. 283. ˜Lines 9-26 were pasted over ll.
849-876 of 14ᵃ. *Lines 1-67 are to be inserted between IX and X on 17ᵃ. Lines 68-73
represent the first draft of the opening of viiia on 13*ᵃ. **Lines 1471-1516, marked for
omission, are to be replaced by Addition I on fol. 6ᵃ.

licensed for the stage by Sir George Buc, nephew and successor of Tilney, 31 Oct 1611. Here, too, we find a proviso that certain reformations indicated should be accomplished before the public presentation, and accordingly we find that five of the twenty-seven folios are in four different hands and contain additions and alterations. However, in Sir Thomas More the refractory insurrection scene is merely recast, not omitted; the first scene, the cause of the riots, to which the censor took exception,[1] is left unaltered; nor is there any record that the play was actually staged. Payne Collier's unsupported assumption that Laneham acted in Sir Thomas More[2] is just as unwarranted as Fleay's bold statement under the year 1596,[3] " The Life and Death of Sir Thomas More was certainly acted in this year." Preference must therefore be given to Dr. Greg's theory, p. xiv, that the additions were already in the manuscript when it was submitted for license, and that the play was not produced because compliance with the censor's objections would have proved fatal to a success on the stage. It may be added that the note to " Enter A Messenger " on the top of fol. 13 * [a], sc. viii [a], viz. " Mess T Goodal ", need not indicate more than that Goodal, one of Lord Strange's men in Shakespeare's company,[4] was tentatively designated for the rôle of the messenger. Since the appearance of his name in the extant cast of the Seven Deadly Sins for 1592 has been used to determine the date of More as of the same year, this possibility must be kept in mind when we come to the discussion of the date of the play.

The thirteen original leaves have been assigned by all critics to one definite hand. Not typically a scribe's handwriting, it is nevertheless regular and characteristic enough to play no part in the palaeographical confusion. As in the case of Tilney, however, so here, too, we have other important considerations connected with the calligraphy; at this point, that of the author-

---

[1] For the broader aspects of the censorship, cf. V. C. Gildersleeve, Government Regulation of the Elizabethan Drama, Diss., Columbia Univ., New York, 1908, p. 55 et al.

[2] Shakespeare, i, cix, apud Greg, p. xx.

[3] A Chron. Hist. of the Life and Work of Wm. Shakespeare, Lond. 1886, p. 292.

[4] Fleay, A Chron. Hist. of the London Stage, London, 1890, p. 84.

ship of the play, as a whole, or, rather, as represented by the thirteen folios. The former aspect of the question is discernible in the attitude of at least two scholars. Fleay assigns the play, as a whole, to Thomas Lodge, " but this depends on the correctness of my identification of Lodge with Philomusus in The Return from Parnassus." [1] Elsewhere, too, he supports Lodge's authorship; [2] but it is noteworthy, with respect to the preceding paragraph, that here he decides for 1594 as the year of the performance. However, in Biog. Chron. I, 138, he prefers, " more or less conjecturally ", Michael Drayton!

Hopkinson may be recorded in agreement with Fleay as to Lodge.[3] On the other hand, J. A. Symonds is inclined to see in the play " the style of Heywood in the making ".[4]

However, the consideration of the authorship of the original leaves alone has led to more definite results. Brooke, p. xlviii, maintained that we have here " a clean copy, made perhaps not by the author himself, but by a professional scribe." Nor did Greg believe that the original folios of the play represented an autograph composition, but placed himself on record to the effect that " supposing the original text to be the work of a single author, and supposing that author's hand to occur anywhere in the extant manuscript, then the evidence points to that hand being *B* " (p. xviii; the hand found only on fols. 7 [a] and 16 [a] of the additions). Subsequent events showed that his diagnosis of the case was incorrect.[5] For a recent identification of the handwriting in Sir Thomas More with the signed collotype autograph of Munday's John a Kent and John a Cumber, 1596, (in The Tudor Facsimile Texts), as well as with the introductory pages of Munday's Heaven of the Mind, 1602, (Brit. Mus. Add. 33384), has established quite conclusively the penmanship, at least, of the original folios.[6] In a later state-

---

[1] A Biographical Chron. of the English Drama, II, Lond. 1892, p. 312. Also Life and Work of Shakespeare, p. 292.

[2] Chron. Hist. London Stage, p. 154.

[3] Introduction to his edition of Sir Thomas More, Lond. 1902.

[4] Shakspere's Predecessors in the English Drama. New ed., London, 1900. Pages 296 ff., 332 ff., 350 ff. are of interest.

[5] Mention is made of the circumstance because his correlation (pp. xvi-xix) of the various hands of the MS. is thus deprived of most of its meaning and force.

[6] Thompson, Shakespeare's Handwriting, p. xii.

ment, Greg placed [1] the hand in More midway in date between the other two autographs. That Munday was perhaps also the author of the pages, and not a mere copyist, is immaterial to the actual subject-matter of this discussion. Anthony Munday, 1553–1633,[2] actor, priest-baiter, author, spy, embezzler, pageanter and balladist, had a lack of originality which, for collaborative purposes, agrees well with the present requirement. He seems to have been concerned in 18 plays and, from the accounts of Henslowe's Diary, to have laid Chettle, Drayton, Hathaway, Wilson, Dekker, Middleton and Webster under contribution.[3] There seems also to be a definite allusion to Munday in the play, altho not in his handwriting. Addition II, top of fol. 7 [b], we read, " Att an other doore S[r] Iohn Munday Hurt." Sir John has been wounded by the prentices. Such allusions are by no means infrequent in Elizabethan drama,[4] but they must be used only in connection with other corroborative material. Anthony Munday, then, may be accepted, for our working purposes, as the author of Sir Thomas More. One of his collaborators, at least, seems to have been recognized, by a comparison of fol. 13 [b], lower half, (the sole occurrence of the hand), with other extant manuscripts, to be Thomas Dekker.[5] Dekker's, we have seen before, is one of the joint authors' names which we compiled from Henslowe.

Two more hands can without difficulty be added to the above elimination. They are the distinctive features found on fols. 6 [a] and 7 [a], 16 [a & b], respectively. They resemble none of the other specimens and are seen nowhere else, save that the writer of the latter set appears also in the marginal additions

---

[1] Mod. La. Review, viii (1913), 89.

[2] Cf. Dict. of Nat. Biography, xxxix, 290 ff.

[3] Southey described his translation of the Palmerin of England as the " Grub Street Patriarch's worst piece of work ", and Ben Jonson ridiculed him in his earliest play, The Case is Altered, 1599, as Antonio Balladino, ' in print for the best plotter '.

[4] Cf. Wily Beguiled, 1606 (Malone Society Reprints, 1912), where the Prologue is addressed by the Juggler as ' humorous George '—one of the circumstantial arguments for George Peele's authorship of the play.

[5] W. W. Greg and Sir George Warner, late Keeper of MSS. at the British Museum, apud Greg, pp. ix and x. The MSS. are Brit. Mus. Add. 30262, fol. 66 [b] and Henslowe's Diary, fols. 101 and 114 at Dulwich College.

to the original Munday pages. The question of their authorship is undecided, and unimportant for our present purposes. A glance at Table II (pp. 238 f.) will reveal the fact that the problem has now been narrowed down to the handwriting of only a comparatively small number of folios, viz. 7 ^{b}, 8 $^{a \& b}$, 9 ^{a}, 11 * ^{b}, 12 $^{a \& b}$, 13 ^{a}, the upper half of 13 ^{b}, and 13 * ^{a}, with already five hands accounted for. According to Brooke, p. xlvii, the manuscript was written in five different hands, "possibly only four. . . . According to Dr. Furnivall there are clearly six, and perhaps seven." If these scholars refer solely to the hands actually at work upon the literary make-up of the play and do not include either the censor Tilney's corrections or the large formal type of the title on the wrapper, it is difficult to see what divisional lines they could consistently set up. Dr. Greg, p. vii, distinguishes seven specimens inclusive of that of the Master of the Revels; that is to say, six actual collaborators. Clearly, then, the question has assumed a more complicated aspect since the time when the late Richard Simpson, acknowledging the total absence of contemporary evidence,[1] assigned the scenes corresponding to fols. 7 ^{b}, 8 $^{a \& b}$, 9 ^{a}, 12 $^{a \& b}$ and 13 $^{a \& b}$ to the skill *and* pen of Shakespeare, and recognized, besides the writer responsible for the thirteen original leaves, only two other variant autographs. Spedding, the noted Bacon-scholar, who soon became interested in the new 'Shakespeare discovery', was able to discern one more, *i. e.* five distinct calligraphies and, giving a doubtful value to fol. 13 ^{b} (scene viii, 212–242, the Dekker hand of Greg's later system), was the first to isolate, as Shakespeare's, the three pages, 8 ^{a}, 8 ^{b} and 9 ^{a} (scene vi, 123–270), which form the pivotal point of Sir E. M. Thompson's recent investigation.[2]

[1] "Are There Any Extant MSS. in Shakespeare's Handwriting?", pp. 1-3, Notes and Queries, Ser. iv, vol. viii, 1871.

[2] "Shakespeare's Handwriting", pp. 227 ff.; iv, Notes and Queries, x, 1872. Of this we read in an interesting passage in Alfred Lord Tennyson, A Memoir by his Son, (New York, 1897, ii, 291), "Spedding insisted that Shakespeare, among the many plays he edited for the stage, had corrected a play on Sir Thomas More in the British Museum. It is a poor play, but Spedding believed that the corrections were possibly in Shakespeare's actual handwriting." This private glimpse, gained from Tennyson's words, shows that Spedding's theory was by no means put forth with full assurance.

TABLE II

A comparison of scholarly opinion as to the scope and distribution of the various specimens of handwriting in the text of *Sir Thomas More.*

(The original indices are retained!)

Folio	3ab, 4ab, 5ab	6a	7a	7b	8a, 8b, 9a	10ab, 11ab	11*b
		Add. I.		Addition Two.			Add. III.
Simpson	Hand A	Hand B	C	Shakespeare's autograph composition, Henderson's Act II, sc. 3 and 4, 1-172. Hand D		Hand A	Hand D
Spedding	Hand A	Hand B	C	D II, 3.	Shakespeare's hand. Hand E	Hand A	Hand D Spedding's index!
Brooke	Hand A Henderson's I, 1, 2, 3, and II, 1.	Hand B Only here.	C II, 2.	Shakespeare's, as in Simpson. Henderson's II, 3 and 4, 1-172. Hand D Opinion also of Mr. Herbert of the British Mus.		Hand A II, 4, 173-273; III, 1, 2, 23.	Hand D III, 2, 1-21.
Greg	Scribe, S Sc. 1-5.	Hand A Greg's index! sc. 13.	B Greg's author of the Play! sc. 4, 1-65.	C sc. 4a.	Hand D Sc. 6, non-committal as to Shakespeare. Mr. Warner is not sure that this is the sole extent of D. Sir E. M. Thompson isolates this as Shakespeare's.	Hand S sc. 6-8a.	Hand C sc. 8.

TABLE II—Continued

Folio	12^{ab}, 13^a, 13^b	13^{*a}	14^{ab}, 15^b	16^a, 16^b	17^{ab} to 22^a	Remark
Simpson	Addition IV.	Add. V.		Add. VI.		
	D, Shakespeare. Act III, sc. 2.	Hand *D* III, 3.	*A*	*C*	Hand *A*	The hand of the Censor, Tilney, appears on fol. 3^a, 5^a, and 17^b.
Spedding	his Hand *D*, III, 1–282. From 283 to end, perhaps Hand *E*, Shakespeare's.	*his D* III, 3.	Hand *A*	*C*	Hand *A*	
Brooke	III, 2, 22–282 is Hand *D*, that of the poet. Lines 283–322 is Hand *E*, only here.	*D*	*A* III, 2, and IV, 1.	*C* IV, 1.	Hand *A* IV, 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5; V, 1, 2, 3 and 4.	
Greg	Hand *C*, as far as sc. 8, 1–181 and 182–211 on 13^b; but 212–end is Hand *E*, his Dekker hand.	*C* sc. 8a.	Hand *S* sc. 8b and 9.	*B* sc. 9a.	Hand *S* sc. 10–17.	

There has been, then, a decided lack of unanimity over the fixation of the mooted Shakespearian addition. This circumstance, in itself, is far from incriminating; it is, however, significant enough not to be omitted from any complete record of the case; it acquires added meaning in combination with other available testimony.

Thompson's procedure, in one vitally important respect, falls short of the scope set before him by Spedding. The latter posited, and very properly, two leading questions, 1. Does the workmanship of the part under discussion bear internal evidence that Shakespeare was the workman? 2. Does the penmanship bear internal evidence that the penman was the author? If the first question necessitated a negative decision, then, he held, the second could offer no interest at all. Thompson's monograph, content to rest on the favorable *impressions* of a few literary critics, confines itself, as we have before said, solely to the matter of palaeographical evidence. His high authority in such a province is in itself an earnest of careful and conscientious research; his testimony as an expert in handwriting should but receive confirmation when subjected to rigid checks.

II.

If we were acquainted with the kind of hand Shakespeare wrote, it would be comparatively easy to discover what words or passages he wrote. As a matter of fact, however, there are extant only six authentic signatures of the poet, no two of them spelled alike, altho each seemingly conforming to a pronunciation which would be represented by the French words *chaque espère*.[1] These signatures, well-known to Shakespeare students, are affixed, respectively, to three certificates and to the poet's last will. For the sake of present convenience as well as of later discussion, they may be divided as follows: Group I. a) Affidavit, 11 May 1612, b) Bill of Sale, 10 March 1613, c) Mortgage Deed, 11 March 1613, Group II. a) b) c) one signed to each of the three sheets of the Will, 25 March 1616. Professor C. W. Wallace of Nebraska, who discovered the 1612 autograph, in an article

[1] The poet's name is capable of permissible permutations running into the thousands. Cf. Wise, Autograph of W. S. . . . . 4000 ways of spelling the name, 1869.

written in 1910 [1] declares for the genuineness also of the abbreviated " W^m. She " [2] in the Aldine Ovid's Metamorphoses, and recently, on his lecture tour,[3] gave the impression of accepting, besides the most likely authentic signature [4] inscribed in a copy of Florio's translation of Montaigne's Essays, 1603, one in Warner's Albion's England, 1612, one in each of the volumes of Pliny's A Historie of the World, 1602, and one in Bartholomaeus Anglicus, De proprietatibus rerum, 1597. There may be peculiar and fresh evidences for recognizing the validity of these new specimens,—the latter signatures are especially referred to, since the Ovid signature is palpably a clumsy tracing of IIc,—but it seems to be the opinion of many scholars [5] that all the signatures save the six above enumerated are to be repudiated. (There is, besides, in the possession of E. Hawkins of Newbury, England, the following alleged autograph: 'Thyne sweeteste. W. Shakspere Stratt Forde March 16'.) In fact, when we recall the forgeries, by William Henry Ireland, of entire plays like Henry the Second and Vortigern and Rowena,[6] or G. A. Rhodes' Gunpowder Plot, or the fraud and forgery surrounding the strange fate of The Reuells Booke, 1605,[7] not to speak of the ridiculous sight of old Boswell on his knees, reverently kissing Ireland's fabricated Shakespeareana and bursting out into a sort of *Nunc Dimittis*,[8] we must be extremely careful not to be led astray by too much of that generous zeal which is prone to stamp each new discovery with the seal of authenticity.

A skilled philologist can tell the age of a manuscript as well as the age of a man. Accordingly, there has been no difficulty in docketing the authentic signatures of Shakespeare into the

[1] Harper's Monthly, vol. 120, 489 ff., " New Shakespeare Discoveries.":
[2] According to Lee: Shre, but according to S. A. T.: Shr.
[3] Personal observation of the writer, Spring, 1917.
[4] See the Appendix to the present study.
[5] Cf. Sir Sidney Lee, A Life of William Shakespeare. New edition, New York, 1916, pp. 516 ff. and Sir E. M. Thompson, in Shakespeare's England, I, 299–309.
[6] Cf. " The Confessions " of William-Henry Ireland, London, 1805.
[7] Cf. E. Law, Some Supposed Shakespeare Forgeries, London, 1911, and More About Sh. " Forgeries ", 1913,—a vindication of the entries.
[8] Cf. Scott and Davey, Historical Documents, London, 1891, p. 91, and J. A. Farrer, Literary Forgeries, London, 1907, p. 232.

date-class of the late sixteenth century. The English script
of this time bears a close resemblance to the features of the
modern German; that is, if we do not insist too stringently
upon the separation of the latter's printed and cursive types,
and of its majuscule and minuscule forms. It is the charac-
ter which, since the decay, in the 12th century, of the fine
Roman writing and the advent of capricious ornamentation
in types, was current, in one form or other, among all the
Teutonic nations, English, German, Dutch and Scandinavian.[1]
In contrast to the round and graceful Roman type of the
Renaissance, the Gothic is more angular, more slowly written
and more disjointed. It has elongated and recurved top-
strokes and a multiplicity of tails, points and acute angles.[2]
A very characteristic difference from the Roman types con-
sists in the prolongation of bases and summits into bent convex
lines directed towards the body of the letter. If we now
analyze either the specimens referred to, or the easily accessi-
ble, so-called, Shakespeare hand in a school-book now in the
Library of Congress, Washington, A Booke Containing Divers
Sortes of Hands, etc. Set forth by Iohn de Beau Chesne and
M. Iohn Baildon. Imprinted at London by Thomas Vau-
trouillier dwelling in the blackefrieres, M. D. LXXXI,[3] we
shall note such striking similarities as *r* with a double stem;
e with a reverse loop; *d*, again, like the German; final *s*, like
a German cursive final *s*, but with the upper arc reversed left-
ward; *y*, as well as *h*, each have a long outward tail, their
descenders being at times of inordinate length; *h* is conjoined

[1] The letter addressed by the University of Louvain to its agent in
Rome, 1601, found on p. 353 of Reusens, Éléments de Paléographie,
Louvain, 1899, gives an example of the contemporary continental variety
of the style. Georg Mentz, Handschriften der Reformationszeit, Bonn,
1912, illustrates the typically German forms of cursive Gothic.
Thompson's Introduction to Greek and Latin Palaeography, Oxford,
1912, contains excellent specimens of the kindred old English calli-
graphy; cf. no. 244.

[2] The Benedictines attributed its origin to a confused mixture of
capital, uncial, minuscule and cursive letters, turned backward, as well
as upside down. Cf. Silvestre, Universal Palaeography, trans., London,
1850, Vol. I, p. 648.

[3] Another book in the same Library will be of interest, The Writing
Schoolmaster. By John Davies of Hereford. Sold by Michaell Sparke
at ye blue Bibell in Greene Arbor, London, 1631.

particularly with a preceding *t* or *s* into a typical ligature; *c* is like the German cursive minuscule with the small upper curve; the long *s,* initial and medial, as well as the ligature *st,* are, again, analogous to the cursive German minuscule, *f* rather to the majuscule; *k* is very frequently a replica of the small printed, or even the written German type; *p* has a top in every respect similar to that of the cursive German *p* or *x;* minuscule *a* is preceded by the flourish found in the German capital 𝔄; capital *S,* as in Shakespeare's signatures, is exactly the German serpentine 𝔖. All these characteristics, and more, go towards the make-up of what is termed the " secretary " style,[1] which was much in vogue not only among professional scriveners and legal scribes but among other writers as well. It is the hand of Shakespeare's signatures.

In the usage of the educated classes this rugged and tortuous native English style was, at the beginning of the seventeenth century, practically supplanted by the cursive Italian handwriting,—the prototype of our modern Italics. The matter might perhaps be put more correctly by stating that the private correspondence of even the literati shows adherence to the old system. A letter of Francis Bacon in the Harleian Collection,[2] or a finer specimen in Dr. Rainolds' letter to Dr. Thornton, dated 5 Feb 1591/2,[3] is in the native English style. In a manuscript facsimile of Ben Jonson,[4] that contemporary of Shakespeare is seen abandoning some of the features of the old in favor of the more pleasing traits of the new style. It is one of the clear, but by no means entirely novel, points of Thompson's investigation that Shakespeare's calligraphy is referred to this orthodox method taught in the free school of his native Stratford.[5] While he is naturally not enabled to submit the proof direct, it may be accepted as

[1] Cf. Wright, Court Hand Restored, ed. Martin, 1879, p. xii.

[2] MS. 6997, f. 72, accessible in G. F. Warner's Universal Classic Manuscripts, Washington and London, 1901, where, curiously enough, a letter, in a similar style, by Sir Thomas More, 1534, may be found, Cotton MS. Cleopatra E. vi. f. 176.

[3] Corpus Christi College, MS. 352, conveniently viewed on p. 232 of Boas, University Drama in the Tudor Age, Oxford, 1914.

[4] Royal MS. 18 A. xlv. ff. 2b, 3, in Warner's Manuscripts.

[5] Shakespeare's England, I, p. 297; Shakespeare's Handwriting, pp. 2 ff.

a fact that the poet was taught the strokes of the older style. Progress is always slower in the provinces; and, in fact, a letter of the year 1596 to Shakespeare from Richard Quiney of Stratford (father of the man who married the poet's daughter Judith) evidences all the traits of the Gothic style.[1] It is almost axiomatic that habits of writing, as well as those of speech, become so automatic and unconscious that it is usually impossible to change them radically. We are therefore more than inclined to lend credence to Thompson's theory that, altho he withdrew from the grammar school at the age of thirteen, Shakespeare would continue to employ the style which he had been taught in his youth. We even add that the case for the poet's authorship of the debated addition to Sir Thomas More is materially aided by the knowledge that transcriptions of theatrical productions, as shown by extant fragments of Greene's Historie of Orlando Furioso, c. 1591,[2] often were done in the same rough and angular style which appears in the More folios. ·

Shakespeare may have been a butcher's boy, a deer-poacher, horse-groom or a lawyer's copy clerk. Evidence there is none.[3] Equally fanciful would seem the theory that Richard Field found work for his young countryman in Vautrouillier's printing office,[4] or that, as John Aubrey reports it,[5] he had even been a schoolmaster in the country. That, however, he

[1] No. 318, Stratford Museum; cf. Shakespeare's England, p. 294, as well as D. H. Lambert, Cartae Shakespeareanae, Sh. Documents, London, 1904, p. 28.

[2] Malone Society Reprints, 1907.

[3] Various interpretations have been advanced of Thomas Nash's prefatory epistle to Greene's Menaphon, 1589. We content ourselves with quoting a part, "It is a common practice now a daies amongst a sort of shifting companions, that runne through every arte and thrive by none, to leave the trade of Noverint whereto they were borne, and busie themselves with the endevours of art, that could scarcelie latinize their neck verse if they should have neede." It may be that this refers to Shakespeare whom the vitriolic Greene excoriated three years later in his "Groat's worth of Wit". On the other hand, Thomas Kyd may be intended, whose father, we have reason to believe, was a sort of a lawyer's scrivener. Cf. Dict. of Nat. Biography, vol. xxxi, p. 349.

[4] Blades, Shakspere and Typography, 1872.

[5] A. Clark, Aubrey's 'Life', 2 v. Oxford, 1898. Cf. also W. Wetz, Die Lebensnachrichten über Shakespeare, Heidelberg, 1912.

could write a fluent hand, is both attested by Heminges and Condell,[1] and evidenced in the 1612 signature discovered by Dr. Wallace which, altho the *W* seems somewhat constrained, is neither cramped because of limitations of space nor palsied by the breath of approaching death. It is, at the same time, an open question whether the scanty remains furnished by the six signatures, fourteen letters in all, inclusive of the phrase, ' By me ', on the last leaf of the testament, can be utilized as material perfect and conclusive enough to secure more than a number of general inferences. Spedding, who was not acquainted with the free and bold autograph of 1612, is manifestly fantastic when he declares of the mooted hand in the Munday play,[2] " It is a hand which answers to all we know about Shakespeare's. It agrees with his signature; which is a simple one, written in the ordinary character of the time, and exactly such a one as would be expected from the writer of this scene, if his name was William Shakspere, and he wrote it in the same way." This statement, to which we shall return in a later section of this study, is open to two vital objections. First, it confuses the generic qualities of a period with the specific resemblances which alone can furnish proof for argument.[3] Both the signatures of Shakespeare and the " additional three pages " indicated by Spedding show the characteristic features of the waning English script; but they offer no more evidence, in and for themselves, of representing the calligraphy of one and the same person than do the resemblances that necessarily exist—and can be pointed out—between two or more sets of manuscript specimens within any given epoch. We recommend the test with a well-known

[1] Cf. Reprint of the First Folio of 1623, London, 1876, " his mind and hand went together, and what he thought he uttered with that easiness that we have scarce received from him a blot in his papers." This statement may perhaps refer only to some of the later works of the poet,—it is certain that the editors of the Folio made use in several instances of printed copies of the old Quarto editions,—but it cannot alter the significance of the implication.

[2] Notes and Queries, x, 228.

[3] It is interesting to see that Sir E. M. Thompson whose book came into my hands after the preliminary historical investigation of the question was completed, brings the same charge against the naïveté of Richard Simpson. Cf. Shakespeare's Handwriting, p. 38.

17

modern type, such as the American Spencerian or, even more, with the American Vertical style, which is so prevalent in the handwriting of the present period.

Our second objection to Spedding's opinion, more apparent than real, has a significant bearing upon the scope, in the present instance, of Thompson's palaeographical comparisons. If the question of Shakespeare's participation in Sir Thomas More can be isolated to the three folio pages, 8^a, 8^b and 9^a, a view in which Thompson has followed the example of Spedding and Greg, p. ix, the problem becomes appreciably simplified, because such a procedure would set aside for observation the crucial literary passage, together with what would appear to be a typical calligraphy. Brooke and two contemporary palaeographists, Mr. Herbert of the British Museum and Sir George Warner, late Keeper of the Manuscripts at the same institution, have, however, arrived at a different conclusion. The last-named authority is inclined to believe that "the leaves containing the insurrection scene (the above three pages) are in a different hand from the rest, but he is not sure of the matter." This seems to be an interesting reversion to Simpson according to whom, in addition to these folios, 7^b, $12^{a \& b}$, $13^{a \& b}$, and 13^{*a} should also be assigned to Shakespeare. But as the second half of 13^b (Greg's E 212-242; Brooke's iii, 2, 283-322), as we have seen, is surely the handiwork of another writer, most likely Dekker, it is worthy of note that Herbert "considers all the scenes ascribed by Simpson to Shakespeare to be in one handwriting, with the exception of iii, 2, ll. 283—end." The quotation (as well as the one above) is derived from Brooke[1] who is in absolute harmony with the latter findings. While, now, a conscientious examination on the part of the present writer has disclosed some facts which make it impossible for him to agree with any view tending towards the identification of hands C and D, in their totality, it has also revealed such startling similarities between the two specimens that, granting a method and material may yet be found for the final adjudication of D to Shakespeare, he is unable to accept Thompson's findings without further ado. An analysis and criticism here of the

---

[1] Shakespeare Apocrypha, p. xlix.

methods pursued by Thompson becomes thus of immediate necessity. This method consists in taking the six authenticated signatures of Shakespeare, analyzing the letters singly and in their ligatures,[1] and comparing the results thus obtained with the observations gained from a similar scrutiny of the three-page addition to Sir Thomas More. We must here remember that signatures Ia and Ib [2] are in reality the only ones available for a fully reliable comparison, because Ic, far from being free and untrammeled, is in a formal, 'printed' hand,[3] and the second group, as a whole, is marked by bodily infirmity.[4] The discovery, therefore, or the authentication of any more signatures might have an appreciable influence upon the testimony elicited from the present fund—and form— of the fourteen letters, a, e, h, i, k, l, m, p, r, s, y, B, S, W. It may even turn out in time that, with the authenticity of the Montaigne signature established, we shall possess in it a nearer criterion of Shakespeare's handwriting at the time of the composition of Sir Thomas More (about ten years, as we shall see, before the deposition signature of 1612) than in any other of the accepted autographs. But, as matters now stand, Thompson has concluded that, whilst the handwriting of Shakespeare was " of an ordinary type ", and presented " few salient features for instantaneous recognition ",[5] there could still be distinguished such typically Shakespearian marks of identification as a certain carelessness of attitude; the delicate introductory upstrokes in IIc; the employment of the Italian

[1] Shakespeare's England, I, 299–309, and Shakespeare's Handwriting, pp. 1 ff. Cf. also Sir Sidney Lee, A Life of William Shakespeare, New York, 1916, pp. 518–523.

[2] Cf. p. 240 of the present investigation.

[3] Not lack of space, as heretofore held, but the oily surface of the parchment is the cause of this careful cramping. (S. A. T.)

[4] In connection with the second group, Sir E. M. Thompson acutely observes, p. 12, that the usual theory that the variation in the three signatures affixed to the will has to be explained on the ground that the poet wrote them at different times, cannot be tenable, because the legal procedure would require him to sign the documents at the time of the execution. This explanation accounts for the comparative fullness and elaborateness of the last signature by making it the first one penned, attached to the most important sheet, and emphasized by the words, *By me.*

[5] Handwriting, p. 29.

long *s* in Ib and Ic; the unusual form of the *k* reminiscent
of the German cursive letter, best observed in Ib and IIb;
a spur on the open *u*-shaped *a*, as in Ia.[1] We are told that all
these traits are to be observed in the folios 8 [a], 8 [b], and 9 [a] of the
More additions, and that their cumulative evidence must in-
evitably point to Shakespeare's authorship of these pages.

There is a clear gain in the characterization given of these
three folios. It has at all times been taken for granted that the
pages represent the autograph composition of some author, and
not a mere scrivener's transcript. Dr. Greg has, besides,
pointed out, p. xiii, that he is a careless joint author who
shows little respect for the play as a whole. Sir E. M.
Thompson, p. 41, perceives in the first two pages evidences of
haste, of rapid, speedy writing, whilst the last leaf is written
with deliberation: the first pages picture the noisy tumult of
the insurgents, the last page More's persuasive speech to the
rioters. " If rare good fortune," he remarks elsewhere of the
author, p. 55, " should ever lay before our eyes the autograph
MSS. of Shakespeare's plays, we should expect to find, for
example, the second style in Hamlet, the first in The Merry
Wives of Windsor." The more deliberate style would then
be the one which, because of temporary pauses and loss of
momentum, would represent the personal peculiarities of the
writer, among them the otiose upstrokes. The full value of
this method is, however, impaired by the fact that folios 7 [b],
11 * [b], 12 [a & b], 13 [a], the upper part of 13 [b], and 13 * [a], which
Thompson omits from his consideration, but the striking gen-
eral similarity of which to the other three pages is beyond
cavil and doubt (cf. above, Simpson, Brooke, Herbert and
Warner), will be found to contain all but, perhaps, one of the
specific resemblances upon which Shakespeare's authorship of
the three folios has been built!

General traits of resemblance: *C*, the collective index of the
second list of folio leaves, is, like *D*, the hand of the three
folios, written in an old English handwriting, well-formed
and, similarly, regular enough to evoke the suspicion of pro-
fessional training. It can also be said to be of an ordinary
type and presenting " few salient features for instantaneous

[1] Op. cit. pp. 19–29.

recognition." As studied on 7 ^{b} and 13 ^{a}, it has a strong pretence to beauty which is reminiscent of 9 ^{a} of hand D. It agrees, furthermore, with D in the almost typical total absence of punctuation marks. Delicate introductory upstrokes, in contrast to comparatively heavy downstrokes, declared by Thompson to be a peculiar feature, are not as uniformly abundant as they are on 9 ^{a}; but if due account is taken both of the manifestly more speedy nature of hand C and of the seemingly more absorbent nature of the paper it is found upon, then there still remains the fact that there are more and clearer upstrokes on 13 ^{a}—they are, of course, by no means lacking on the other leaves—than on either 8 ^{a} or 8 ^{b}.

Specific resemblances may next be noted between C and D, the scheme followed being that employed by Thompson, viz. the successive minuscule and majuscule letters of Shakespeare's signatures, so that the triangular similarities are evident at the first glance. The following list features, as far as possible, all those points in C in which an agreement exists between D and S (the signatures):

a—the normal closed and the open, arched-link (u-shaped) forms are commonly employed. Examples of a ligature with a preceding h, for instance, fol. 7 ^{b}, l. 13, fol. 11 $*$ ^{b}, l. 19, fol. 12 ^{a}, l. 14, in the words, ' sharpe ', ' behaviour ' and ' hairie '. The open a with a backspur, which is found frequently in D, is not a common trait of C. The latter might evidence instances, such as fol. 12 ^{a}, l. 21, ' share ', l. 22, ' chaine ',—7 ^{b}, l. 3, ' are ', is the clearest,—but the condition of the leaf—the absorbent paper permits much of 12 ^{b} to be seen thru—and in general the closely written lines make such fine strokes difficult to discern. In the matter of a number of similar open a's on 8 ^{a}, as in l. 4, 9, etc., definite identification is likewise impossible. We prefer, however, to rest the case with the finding that C totally *lacks* this form. We must add in the same breath that among the six authentic signatures of Shakespeare only a single one, Ia, contains the backspur a, that four of them, Ic and the whole group II, do not show even the ligature of the letter with the preceding h, and that, of course, the form in question can by no means be said to be the exclusive peculiarity of the poet. The so-called Baconian Promus MS. and Shakespeare's Will are full of it.

c—The reversed loop, as well as the form composed of two unlooped curves can be observed in *C*. Cf. fol. 12ᵇ, l. 34, 'Learned' and l. 47, 'vew'.

h—also creates a feature of resemblance, in that the *h* with the looped head and pendent bow occurs, linked or unlinked with the following letter. Examples are unnecessary, but it must be noted that the descenders in both *D* and *C* often are drawn into the next line.

k—The variety of forms found in Shakespeare's signatures is common also to *C* as well as *D*. The following examples from *C* will suffice to show that we have here both the normal looped stem with a right angle or round base and the l-formations (seen in signatures Ib and IIb, as well as in 9ᵃ, l. 39, 15 and 40, words 'knyves', 'knees', 'lyke'), fol. 7ᵇ, l. 4, 'knock', 11 * ᵇ, l. 18, 'thinke', l. 14, 'physickt', 13ᵃ, l. 58, 'musick', 21ᵃ, l. 15, 'thinke', l. 31, 'cloakes', etc.

m—nothing peculiar in the formation of this letter. An exchange of convexity and concavity in the minims is found in *C*, tho not to the extent of its occurrence in *D*.

p—fol. 7ᵇ, l. 5, 14, fol. 12ᵃ, l. 36, 'prentises', 'prisoners', '*p*ted', etc. will show letter with the medium stem as well as with the stroke meant to abbreviate *per* or *par*. There is no need to speak of the printed short-stem form in signature Ic.

r—this letter Thompson has omitted from his comparison of *D* and *S*, altho it is found in both. The reason seems to be that *r* occurs in the signatures only in the left-shouldered shape which is quite current to-day. But the important fact remains to be recorded that both *D* and *C* feature overwhelmingly the double-stemmed form reminiscent of the cursive German type.

s—To Thompson it seems to be a strong evidence for identity that a few instances of this letter appear in *S* and *D* not in the traditional English but in the Italian form: Ib, Ic, and IIc of the signatures as well as two corrections in D, 9ᵃ, l. 7 and l. 18. The former case, the present writer holds, is doubtful: in l. 7 the stroke may have been intended as part of the word below the line (read, 'only'); in 18, an objection is less evidently valid. Even so, if this letter is the sole one of the foreign type to be used in *S* and *D*, it is strange that it should also be found in *C*, in at least three places, fol. 7ᵇ, l. 16, 'Sᵗ',

13 ª, l. 10 and 36, 'Erasmus'. But, in the 'Dekker' hand of
13 ᵇ it is of quite common occurrence.

B—The scrivener's elaborate type, found in signature IIc,
is similarly common and similarly shaped in both additions;
cf. for *C,* fol. 7 ᵇ, l. 7, ' Backt ', 13 ᵇ, ll. 6 and 11, ' Barber '.

S—The serpentine Old English capital, which Shakespeare
uses in his autographs, is the rule in *C,* even in the stage direc-
tion: 7 ᵇ, l. 1, ' Sʳ '.

W—There seems to be just one capital W in *C,* fol. 13 ª,
l. 28, ' When ', but it is of the same type with the initial curve
that is found in the signatures and in the only examples in *D,*
fol. 8 ª, ll. 35 and 37, ' Wisdome '.

This concludes the specific triangular comparison of the
Signatures, the alleged Shakespeare addition to Munday's play,
and a larger number of folio pages left unconsidered by
Thompson. The results can be formulated to the effect that
the formation of the letters in question,—all there are in *S,*—
has been found to be similar in *D* and *C.* This includes the
backspur *a,* the one foreign type of *s* and the double stemmed *r,*
the latter of which is not to be found in the signatures. The
chief result is, however, the conviction that the theory is not
tenable according to which the presence of certain letter-forms
in *S* and *D* must be taken to bespeak identity; for their absence
is equally no evidence of dissimilarity. It must not be assumed
that Shakespeare had a monopoly of letter forms or that he
employed at all times the same calligraphic style, irrespective
of his mood and writing materials.

Another set of observations has, moreover, been made, which
discloses specific similarities between *D* and *C,* besides that of
the double-stemmed *r.* In so far as they relate to single letters,
such letters are not, of course, present in *S;* but where entire
words are compared, the inference, to the incautious, would
point to identity.

b—besides the form in which the stem is carried down to a
round or pointed base whence the upward curve proceeds, there
is a very peculiar shape with a basic spur like modern cursive
German *B.* See fol. 7 ᵇ, l. 54, ' blowes ', 9 ª, l. 1, ' forbid ', l. 19,
' rebell ', etc. That it is made like our *h,* is shown by 9 ª,
l. 19, ' by '.

v, w—as in *D,* so in *C,* these two letters frequently have an initial flourish; cf. 8 ª, l. 19, ' vppon ', l. 37, ' wisdome ' and 12 ª, l. 22, ' vsher ', l. 6, ' prowd '.

y—the same form in both, with pendent bow in ligature with following letter, as in the case of *h.*

th—characteristic curve-top *t,* combined with the following *h* in a typical manner; cf. 7 ᵇ, l. 6, ' them ' with 9 ª, l. 1, ' that '.

A—without a cross-bar. In *D* the curve has a dot in it, 8 ª, l. 43, or not, 8 ᵇ, l. 14. In *C* the latter variety is found.

D—the enlarged minuscule in both parts.

E—crescent-shaped letter with central cross-bar, at times double, at other times like a loop.

L—sloping; both in *D* and in *C* the same upward and downward strokes, disposition and loop proportion. Numerous examples in text and margin. Fol. 8 ᵇ, l. 11, ' Leade ', 8 ª, l. 38, ' L ', might even be cited to disprove Dr. Greg's contention that 9 ª, marginal ' Linco ' is in *C*'s handwriting.

A few words taken almost at random from both divisions in order to show the similarity : 12 ª, l. 6, ' shouldst ' and 9 ª, l. 29, ' shoold ' (observe especially the ligature of *sh* and *ld*), 12 ª, l. 24, ' hart ' and 8 ª, l. 9, ' hart ', 8 ᵇ, l. 14, ' good ' and 12 ª, l. 29, ' good ', 9 ª, l. 9, ' god ' and 12 ª, l. 4, ' god ', 8 ᵇ, l. 43, ' before ' and 12 ª, l. 28, ' before ', 9 ª, l. 3, ' king ' and 12 ª, l. 28, ' king '. These pairs of words, when placed in juxtaposition, will show even more evidences of consanguinity than any given pair of Shakespeare's signatures, save Ia-Ib and IIb-IIc.

One of the inferences drawn from the above remarks must be the inadequacy of the material furnished by the signatures of Shakespeare. It is sufficient and peculiar enough neither to prove the relationship between *S* and *D,* nor to disprove the possible relationship between *D* and *C.* The latter, in fact, have yielded significant resemblances. A superficial examination will tend to the opinion that there is more in common between any page of *C* and that part of *D* found on p. 9 ª, than between the latter and the very formal and scribal upper quarters of 8 ª and 8 ᵇ alike. The impression gained would thus seem to be that *C* and *D* were penned by one and the same person at different times. However, we are not dealing with the question of similarity but with that of identity. For this purpose, the various degrees and kinds of dissimilarity and diver-

gence are of more decisive importance than are resemblances. The danger inherent in Thompson's procedure, one that tends to vitiate his main contentions, is that of attributing to a fluent and intelligent writer but one rigid and invariable scheme of calligraphy. *Mutato nomine,* it is the argument in vogue against the Shakespearian signatures: this or that autograph cannot be authentic, because of its dissimilarity to the others! It need not be stressed that severe uniformity in informal documents and on all occasions is indicative rather of the calligraphic hesitation of the illiterate. " Es wird jeder," we read in a graphonomic investigation,[1] " der mit dem Gebiete der Handschriftenforschung vertraut ist, mir zustimmen, wenn ich sage, dass es gerade in einer genialen Handschrift unendlich schwer ist, zwei einander völlig gleiche Formen eines Buchstaben festzustellen, weil die Genialität der Handschrift gerade darauf beruht, immer neue Buchstabenformen, immer neue Kombinationen in den Verbindungen der Züge zu schaffen." When thus Madame Thumm-Kintzel, disregarding her own premise, proceeds to identify, on the basis of similarities, the hand of Shakespeare's signatures with the body of the Will and [2] with the hand of the Baconian Promus MS., she commits the precise error Sir E. M. Thompson would seem to be guilty of. As a matter of fact, an astonishing table of similarities can be drawn up from the Testament of Shakespeare and either hand *C* or hand *D*!

Among the variations to be found between the last two specimens may be mentioned the difference of ink, rich dark brown in the former and muddy yellow in the latter.[3] This feature, however, is not vitally important, until connected with other evidence. Such evidence is furnished by the fact that in hand *C* the simple letter *p* is very frequently formed as if it were the ligature ꝑ representing *per* or *par,* whereas in the hand called *D* not only is such a hybrid formation absent but the ligature, wherever found, is employed with correctness. Similarly, the upper loop of the letter *f* in *C* has a marked ten-

[1] M. Thumm-Kintzel, 'Shakespeare-Bacon-Forschung,' Der Menschenkenner, I, 1909, p. 239.

[2] Cf. her article, 'Shakespeare-Bacon and the Promus-Manuscript'— accessible to me in a reprint kindly loaned by Dr. Tannenbaum.

[3] Cf. Greg, pp. vii and ix.

dency to be in the shape of the numeral 3, as against the single
arc found in *D,* or, more distinctive still, the form with the
same numeral turned straight around its axis towards the right.
Also, capital *I* or *J* in hand *D* is of the shape of modern Ger-
man cursive minuscule *h,* whereas in *C* it is provided with a
top arc and a medial stroke. Another letter formed in differ-
ent manner is capital C, which is in general like an O with a
medial cross stroke. In hand *C* it has an upper arc, in *D* it
starts right at the cross-bar. But the most important feature,[1]
exceeding in interest even the general editorship of the *D*
folios by *C,* (*vide* also difference in ink), is the circumstance
that, while both hands, in fact all those concerned in the play,
separate their speeches by lines drawn across the page, those of
D alone begin with a stroke resembling the number 2, and, in
contrast with *C* (which has short and shading-off lines), go
regularly beyond the length of the written line. All these traits
make the identification of these two hands as one a matter of
improbability, even tho, on the basis of Thompson's method,
they could, as we have seen, be declared the work of a single
individual. It is hoped that the unreliability of the deductions
made on the evidence of fourteen letters alone needs no further
proof.[2]

Shakespearian scholars have, indeed, condemned the weak
and prosaic scenes contained in the folios written by *C,* as de-
cidedly un-Shakespearian.[3] There is thus no necessity to
maintain, as Dr. Brooke has maintained, that Shakespeare's
authorship of the Insurrection scenes may still be vindicated if
we consider the commonplace scenes, v[a]: More, Lord Mayor
and Sir John Munday; viii: the Randall-Erasmus-More pas-
sages, containing the soliloquy of More and the comic Faulk-
ner parts; viii[a]: the ' T. Goodal ' scene, as merely transcribed
by the poet. Such a view would find support in the circum-
stance that *C* is seen copying upon fol. 13[*a] six lines written
by *B* on fol. 16[b],—if, that is, *C* were identical with *D,* as Brooke
holds. However, we are sure that the hand that wrote the
inferior scenes was not the hand that wrote the Insurrection
scenes. We are not sure, for we have not sufficient evidence,

---

[1] Pointed out to the writer by Dr. Tannenbaum.
[2] See also the review of T. A. Herbert, in The Library, Jan. 1917, p. 97.
Brooke, op. cit. p. 1 (50) of the Introduction.

that the latter hand was that of Shakespeare. Whether the Insurrection scene, as a piece of literature, is the creation of Shakespeare's fancy, is for the next section to decide. For the present, we set down our finding that the palaeographical evidence for the Shakespearian origin of the More Addition is wanting and unsatisfactory.

III.

The literary aspect of the question, which, for obvious reasons is confined to the Insurrection scene, will be found to present an equally negative conclusion. Sir Thomas More itself lacks not only in dignity but in unity of intention and organization as well. It is a singular play, containing a comedy and a tragedy in one, scenes 1–10 and 11–17, which treats of the life and death of More. For the large part, it lacks significance, the sole passage that can lay claim to literary quality being the eirenic speech wherewith More quells the riot of the citizens of London against the proud Lombard merchants. Were it not for this fact and for the circumstance that, being a ' biographical history ',[1] it brings out in effective relief at least the character of the protagonist, it would have to be classed with such senseless drivel as Fair Em and Mucedorus—both of which have been attributed to Shakespeare by Simpson and by Tieck. It certainly falls, in artistic conception and execution, far behind two other plays of the pseudo-Shakespearian cycle, Arden of Feversham and The Two Noble Kinsmen. Simpson's Shakespearian authorship of the comic parts as well as of the More speech in defense of order rests, in fact, on the very tenuous assumption that we find in them a Shakespearian quality of imagery and humor " quite unlike the poetry of Greene, Marlowe, Lodge or Robert Wilson." It is inconceivable that he chose to omit Ben Jonson as an alternative. Spedding [2] offers a more logical argument. The one scene in the play towers above the others. Nobody then living could have written it save Shakespeare. Tradition, moreover, represents him as a reviser or adapter of plays. He was, thus, called in to mend

[1] Not properly a chronicle play, as in Schelling, The English Chronicle Play, New York, 1902, pp. 214 ff.

[2] His article in the Notes and Queries is reprinted in Reviews and Discussions, etc., not Relating to Bacon, London, 1879.

the scene rejected by the censor. And, in fact,—one is tempted to interpret, " consequently "—the scene bears a resemblance to Shakespeare's youthful works! This, it will be recognized, is an insidious form of special pleading;[1] sheer circumstantial evidence which does not consider the improbability of the revision, as shown by internal earmarks.

Ward,[2] non-committal as to the handwriting, avers that More's speeches to the insurgents have the true Shakespearian manner and feeling, so that " it is with difficulty they can be conceived to have been written by any contemporary author." The first 172 lines of the insurrection scene appear to Brooke[3] more thoroly in the tone of Shakespeare than any other passage in the doubtful plays. Moreover, " it is exactly the sort of scene we should expect Shakespeare to write, had he been called upon to revise the play, full of his well-known sentiments and expressed in a style which is very remarkably like his own during the period 1590-5."

The " authentic ring " of the brief passage,

> ' and leade the majestie of lawe in liom
>   to slipp him lyke a hound '

seems also to have captivated Percy Simpson.[4] The sporting metaphor is not unworthy of Shakespeare. Hence he holds " He would not put forth his strength within the narrow limits of an improvised collaboration. Still less would he sew a patch of royal purple over a rent in the homespun of Anthony Munday."

The balance of critical opinion, however, is toward a decided incredulity. Furnivall[5] finds " nothing necessarily Shaksperean in it, though part of it (is) worthy of him." Fleay,[6] does not admit the collaboration of Shakespeare in the play.

---

[1] Sachs, Die Shakespeare zugeschriebenen zweifelhaften Stücke, in Jahrbuch der deutschen Sh. Gesellschaft, XXVII, 1892, p. 198, follows in the footsteps of Spedding.

[2] History of English Drama, II, 1899, pp. 214 ff.

[3] Introduction, p. li.

[4] Library, Jan. 1917, p. 93.

[5] Introduction to the Royal Shakespeare, 1894, I, p. 115.

[6] Life and Work, 1886, p. 292.

We have quoted Tennyson's views before, p. 237. W. W. Greg [1] cannot, despite the undoubted merit evidenced, regard the pages " with the admiration they have aroused in some critics." According to Creizenach [2] the insurrection " is described in a series of scenes where the unknown author approaches nearer than any one else has done to Shakespeare's masterly manner of handling large crowds on the stage," but Brooke, cf. above, is considered " somewhat bold in our opinion." The matter of Brooke's statement that the scene in question is full of the poet's well-known sentiments, must also be denied in view of the fact that More's speech to the rioters cannot be a sincere exposition of the divine right of kings—if, that is, we are really to think of Shakespeare—because in Richard II the poet treats the theory with mordant irony, and in addition, Henry V stamps him a scorner, at heart, of royal divinity.[3] One is inclined to see in this ultra-loyal attitude rather the work of a Jacobean dramatist whose public utterance would but mirror forth the strictly enforced autocratic theory that to God the King is " a god on earth." The style itself is a matter of doubtful opinion which every reader has to solve for himself. Locrine, to cite but one of the list of Elizabethan dramas that have a mysteriously " communal " style, exhibits peculiarities that remind one of the recognized works of either Greene or Peele. Professor Brander Matthews seems to deliver the fitting pontifical sentence, when he says,[4] " It might be possible to pick out a passage or two in which there may be something of Shakspere's manner. But these passages are very few indeed, and they are discoverable only by the credulous."

It appears, indeed, to the present writer that were it not for the additional interest which the possibility of a Shakespearian holograph lends to the three folio leaves in question—and we have seen the utter inconclusiveness of this matter,—some critics would not so precipitately persuade themselves of the

[1] Op. cit., p. xiii.

[2] The English Drama in the Age of Shakespeare, transl. Philadelphia, 1916, p. 177 and fn.

[3] Cf. Moorman, in Cambridge History of Eng. Literature, V, 1910, pp. 248 ff., and Sidney Lee, Shakespeare and the Modern Stage, New York, 1906, p. 156.

[4] Shakespeare as a Playwright, New York, 1913, p. 366.

Shakespearian authorship of the insurrection scene. Despite wide divergences, there can be found thruout the Elizabethan drama, beside a typical woodenness and restraint, roguish and racy humor and a rare heroic passion,—a rain of spirit, distilled from the overladen literary atmosphere, that has, in a measure, permeated the lowliest as well as the foremost of the dramatists. We speak of polished intellectuality in the German classical period, of the sprightly intellectual brilliancy of French literature: youthful, animal exuberance characterizes the length and breadth of Shakespeare's era. It is supererogatory to maintain that."something Shakespearian" cannot be found in any contemporary production. Even his habit of using strange and recondite legal terms is paralleled in Spenser, Jonson, Massinger and Webster.

The fallacy also of considering the Insurrection scene a youthful work of Shakespeare becomes apparent when the actual date of the play is taken into account. Tilney's marginal directions and his resignation in 1608 in favor of his nephew, Buc (cf. Dict. Nat. Biog.), furnish a terminus ad quem. The references in the play, ll. 1006 and 1149, to Oagle a wig-maker mentioned in Cunningham's Revels Accounts for 1572 and 1584 do not afford a precise terminus a quo. The shop may have been in the possession of the man or of his family even at a much later date. Fleay, who assigned the drama either to Lodge or to Drayton, put its date at 1596, because of the uprising of 1595,[1] but later chanced the year 1594.[2] Simpson, regarding the riots of 1586 as the source of the Insurrection scene, decided for the year 1587.[3] Brooke gave the matter a wide solution by compromising on 1587–1596. We know of no reason—if, that is, this kind of surmise is to be applied—why the bloody May day of 1517,[4] on which the London populace rose against the foreigners, could not have been the source of the allusions, or, for that matter, why 1590–1596, proposed by Farmer,[5] should not be the correct date. Dr. Greg, p. xix,

[1] Life and Work of W. S., London, 1886, p. 292.
[2] History of London Stage, 1890, p. 154.
[3] Furnivall, Leopold Shakespeare, p. 102, "The allusions in the play fix its date as 1586, as Mr. Simpson acknowledged, when Shakespeare was probably at Stratford."
[4] Creizenach, op. cit. p. 177.
[5] The Tudor Facsimile Texts edition of Sir Thomas More, 1910.

seeing no necessity for connecting the Insurrection scene with any particular events,—and rightly so, since the meat of the play is the life of More!—decided first for 1592/3,—a date suitable for Thompson's purposes,[1]—then again for the end of the century [2] which, he holds, would be fatal to the attribution of the addition to Shakespeare.[3] Schücking's investigations, in fact, leave no doubt as to the impossibility of stamping the addition as a specimen of the poet's youthful work.[4] For he demonstrates, by the similarity of parallel passages and phrases, that the mob-scene in the insurrection is an imitation of the mob-scene in Julius Caesar. A comparison with Hamlet, especially the circumstances surrounding the ' play within the play ' (in our play an interlude is given at the banquet, The Marriage of Wit and Wisdom, an altered version of Lusty Juventus; More inquires of the players as to their origin and plans; engages them in his service; extemporizes in the place of a missing actor; the play is not terminated but is abruptly brought to a close, etc.), actual parallelisms, of plot and construction, also with Romeo and Juliet, Henry VI, Fletcher's Tamer Tamed, moreover Lord Cromwell and Heywood's Woman Killed With Kindness,—all this shows that the play could not have been composed before 1604/5, the presupposition being that, as all modern critics admit, Dyce's dating of the additions to Sir Thomas More as of later origin, is to be disregarded. The end of the sixteenth century and the opening of the seventeenth have the identical script-custom, so that such a date would not be impossible from a palaeographical standpoint. The " secretary " is in vogue almost to a similar extent in the later as well as in the earlier period, even university graduates employing the English character in their ordinary correspondence. Shakespeare's autograph signatures, as we have seen, written all within the last four years of his life, between the 11th of May, 1612, and the 25th of March, 1616, are in the old style of handwriting.

[1] Shakespeare's Handwriting, p. 62.
[2] Creizenach also suggests 1600, op. cit. p. 234.
[3] Modern Language Review, VIII, 1913, p. 89.
[4] Das Datum des pseudo-Shakespeareschen Sir Thomas Moore, in Eng. Stud. XLVI, 1913, p. 228.

But, if the Addition is not in the style of Shakespeare's early period,—Professor Schelling being quite right that the hendeca-syllabic character of the verses is very unlike the versification of his youth,[1] the evidence of 'metrical tests', as far as they can be considered reliable from the paucity of the material, will but confirm in a general way the testimony of the external history which we have just recorded. It is understood, of course, that some of the tests must be regarded with distrust, because of the mixture of maturity and immaturity often found in the same play of Shakespeare and because of the anticipation of and reversion to features in many cases.[2] In the Addition we have, according to the manuscript and the diplomatic reprint of Greg, 147 lines. The Addition, moreover, comprises at most only 84 lines of verse, and some of these are so run together as to amount to prose and be of no avail for the test of feminine endings. The results obtained under such circumstances consist of 10 per cent enjambment, 3.5 per cent rhyme, 24 per cent feminine endings, and pause preponderantly at the end and after the second foot. There is not sufficient material for the speech-ending test.

The year 1604 being the year of the composition of Othello, the most perfect of Shakespeare's tragedies, wherein form, language, thought and passion blend more harmoniously than in any other play of the dramatist, we would have to postulate that at this late stage of development, independence and repu-tation,—seven of the eleven plays chosen for the winter season of this year before the royal court were from Shakespeare's pen [3]—, he was guilty of self-plagiarism from his Julius Caesar (to restrict ourselves merely to More's speech and the riotous mob),—the converse, that in Julius Caesar he repeated himself from a 'youthful' work of a decade or so ago, being equally fantastic—and perhaps even performed a scrivener's task of copying a scene, in behalf of such an admittedly in-ferior and insipid play as Sir Thomas More! And from the

---

[1] Chronicle Play, p. 215.

[2] Cf. Sir Sidney Lee, William Shakespeare, new ed. New York, 1916, p. 101; Furnivall, Introduction to the Leopold Shakspere; and Morton Luce, Handbook to the Works of W. S., London, 1906, p. 452, giving the work of Ingram, Fleay and Bradley.

[3] Cf. Lee, new ed., p. 383.

travail of the mountains produced all but a ridiculous rodent
that will scarcely bear frequent inspection! Is it not more
sensible to assume from the ' deadly parallelism ' of the other
plays as well that, considering the prevalence of literary piracy
against which the law afforded no protection,[1] when a Lyly
could without acknowledgment embody in his Euphues a trans-
lation of a Plutarchian letter, and when Greene flung about
wholesale charges of beautification with alien feathers, the
joint authors of Sir Thomas More laid Shakespeare, Fletcher,
Heywood and others equally under a summary contribution?
A Shakespeare *influence,* thus, is more in place here than a
Shakespearian *authorship.* The metrical tests themselves could
assign the Addition to a period far before Shakespeare's
Othello, for the most reliable test, that of run-on lines, puts it
abreast of Henry VI or of The Taming of the Shrew. The
former, we would say, would be rather a terminus a quo, for
the real author, from all impressions, must have been a man of
dramatic talent who was either responsible for the Jack Cade
scenes as well, 2 Henry VI, iv, 2, or at least made use of them
for his mob in the Addition. But of this presently.

No account of the present problem would be complete with-
out a reference, at least, to the psychology of the mob, as a
whole, and to the obviously superior phrases scintillating thru
the pacific speech of Sir Thomas. Expressions like ' hath
Chidd downe all the ma<jes>tie of Ingland ', ' and you in
ruff of your opynions clothd ', ' and leade the ma<jes>tie of
lawe in liom ', ' and this your mountanish inhumanyty ', have
the true Shakespearian ring and appearance. They are, how-
ever, by no means unique in this respect, isolated as they occur
in the appeal of More. A number of similarly striking phrases
and clauses can be culled from other contemporaneous works.
For instance, ' Let him without controulment have his will ',
' That like a mountaine overwhelmes my blisse ', ' Can you in
words make show of amitie, And in your shields display your
rancorous minds? '—from Marlowe's Edward II, could with-
out serious objection be classed as Shakespearian in sense and
sound. Some future evidence may, indeed, be brought for-

[1] Cf. Sheavyn, The Literary Profession of the Elizabethan Age, Man-
chester, 1909, p. 135.

18

ward which may establish definitely the authorship of the mooted pages; in the meantime, however, it is our duty to point out that there exists in the period under discussion not only, what may be called, an orotund utterance of thought but also a common literary possession of striking phrases. A figure, like ' sparkes rakt up in embers ', is to be found thruout the Elizabethan drama, and the turn, ' she bears a duke's revenue on her back ', appears not only in Shakespeare but in Marlowe as well, in Euphues, in The Servingman's Comfort and, in fact, in the range of satire in general.

Nor is the mob, with its logic, philosophy and phraseology, by any means exclusively Shakespearian in tone and behaviour. It *is* typically like the mob of Shakespeare. But, any one who has studied the ' many-headed multitude '[1] in the wake of MacCallum, Oehme and Tupper,[2] has realized that the irrational, impressionable and vacillating crowd, bent on riot under a various-minded leadership, to be pacified in the end by a More or a Clifford, or, indeed, lashed up to fury by an artful Antony, is not the distinctive invention of Shakespeare's fancy, but the expression of a well-established stage convention, composed of easily discernible traditional elements. The insurrection scene in Sir Thomas More is but one instance of the application of a common theatrical pattern which may be studied elsewhere in Jack Straw, Greene (George-a-Greene), Lodge (Wounds of a Civil War), Heywood (the Falconbridge rebellion in Edward IV), Webster (Appius and Virginia), and other predecessors and contemporaries of Shakespeare.

IV.

We would then summarize from the foregoing discussion that nothing memorable or momentous in the nature of palaeographical or literary evidence has as yet been advanced which would establish the existence of a holograph composition of

[1] Horace's belua multorum capitum, a phrase found, in one form or other, in Webster, Fletcher, Chapman, Massinger, and others, as well as in Shakespeare.

[2] Respectively, Shakspere's Roman Plays and their Background, London, 1910,—Die Volksszenen bei Shakespeare und seinen Vorgängern, Berlin, 1908,—' The Shaksperean Mob ', in P. M. L. A., XXVII (1912), 486 ff.

Shakespeare with more than the generous zeal born of a reverent desire to behold the master poet in his work-shop. It is, at the same time, worth our notice that Spedding's remark to the effect that the handwriting of the insurrection scene in Sir Thomas More is "exactly such a one as would be expected from the writer of this scene",[1] whilst a mere obiter dictum, seems to foreshadow all the involved paraphernalia of literary identification which have come to be associated with the name of Eduard Sievers,—and seems to fall by the verdict of this apparatus as well.

The method of muscular reaction, as is well known, is but a practical application of the principle discovered by the Bavarian singer, J. Rutz, to the effect that every piece of music or literature postulates a definite tonal rendition, without which the performance is uneven, laborious, injurious to the vocal chords, and absolutely devoid of subjective satisfaction. It has for one of its aims the acquisition of the correct anatomical pose for the production of sound, spoken or sung.[2] It would lead us too far to rehearse the details of the theory which has definitely established three major types of speech-melody, the Italian, French and German,[3] and various permutations of each with such subordinate types as cold, warm, lyric, dramatic, etc. corresponding to a change in mood and subject-matter. What is of importance to remember is that each of these types and subtypes has been found to depend for its successful performance upon a definite set of movements in the skeletal muscles, and that thru the deliberate execution of these strain combinations, fixated by introspective analysis, any one of the varied types of ' feelings ' can be brought about at will.

When we remember that Flaubert used to spend hours over a sentence, testing it by declamation, humming and beating

[1] Loc. cit. p. 228.

[2] Consult, besides Sievers' Rhythmisch-melodische Studien, Heidelberg, 1912, O. Rutz, Neue Entdeckungen von der menschlichen Stimme, München, 1908; id., Sprache, Gesang und Körperhaltung, 1911; Neues über den Zusammenhang zwischen Dichtung und Stimmqualität, in Idg. Forsch., XXVIII, 301; Musik, Wort und Körper als Gemütsausdruck, Leipzig, 1911; Ueber Sprachmelodisches in der deut. Dichtung, in Annalen der Naturphilos. I, 76; also, F. Krueger, Mitbewegungen beim Sprechen, Singen und Hören, Leipzig, 1910, and Luick, Ueber Sprachmelodisches in deut. und eng. Dichtung, in GRM, 1910, p. 14.

[3] Named so, because the type predominates among those nations.

time to it; when we recall his statement, born of experience
that " a well-constructed phrase adapts itself to the rhythm of
respiration ", or Rémy de Gourmont's that style is first of all
physiological, we can better understand the nature of the dis-
covery that not only does the rhythm or melody of any indi-
vidual piece of human production create in us a definite
kinaesthetic association,—something well-known to psy-
chology,[1]—but also the production as a whole, as a compound
of all such stimuli. We speak of the character of a handwrit-
ing, as well as of the peculiar charm of a Gothic cathedral.
Why does a strain of music remind us of the romantic melody
of Chopin, a suffused scenic atmosphere look, for all the world,
like the work of Corot? We react in a varied manner and
quality to a Grecian vase and to a piece of modern pottery. An
ancient coin not only has a sentimental value, but demands and
registers a definite physical attitude as well. The paintings of
the Italian Renaissance have a certain color-scheme, proportion
and delineation, a certain warmth of tone that is so ' typical ' as
to become infectious, and imitable by a painter in possession of
the requisite technique and sensitiveness. Indefinite state-
ments, such as Buffon's " le style est l'homme même ", or
Samuel Butler's " Every man's work, whether it be literature
or music or pictures or architecture or anything else, is always
a portrait of himself ",[2] can thus be put on a definite basis of
notation, every man to his type. What a corrective or promo-
tive part Sievers' schematic wire-imitations of the typical mus-
cular responses [3] can eventually come to play in the methodical
exploitation of this knowledge, is for the future to decide. The
outstanding facts of the situation, plausible enough to merit
attention, record the applicability of muscular observations
not only to literature, but also to painting, statuary and to
the traits of handwriting as well.[4] Schammberger has obtained

[1] Cf. The Rôle of Kinaesthesis in the Perception of Rhythm, Amer.
J. of Psych. XXIV, 305–359.

[2] The Way of All Flesh.

[3] Described in Katzenstein's Archiv. f. exper. u. klin. Phonetik, I,
1914, 225–252. According to Saran, Das Hildebrandslied, Halle, 1915,
p. 17, " So vermag der geübte Experimentator, fast wie der Augenarzt
die richtige Brille, die für die Betrachtung eines Schriftbildes geeig-
neten Drähte und damit den Typus zu ermitteln."

[4] Rutz, Musik, Wort, Körper, pp. 96 and 442.

identical reactions from the contemplation of Böcklin's paintings and of his calligraphy. Letters of one and the same person in several languages, such as the French and German letters of Frederick the Great, evidence the same type, whereas in the translation of a work the quality of the translator comes to the fore. A conscious imitation, like the late James Whitcomb Riley's Leonainie, in the orthodox manner of Poe, could not, of course, be adduced as evidence of Riley's ' typical ' technic.

If, thus, a definite system of individual ' types ', based on a common psychic principle, exists in correlation with the perception of every individual production, it follows that the consciously sympathetic observation of Shakespeare's literary output, of the creative presence of his ego, as embodied either in the spoken recital of his work, or in the autograph composition of the poet, should be conducive to the identical ' typical ' experience,—the very axiom which Spedding's untutored instinct expressed in a simpler but none the less clear language.

It has been thought necessary to give the above discussion of the principles and examples of this new criterion, because its more general acceptance is impeded, and its modicum of important truth obscured, for lack of a clear formulation as well as because of the enthusiastic exaggeration of its uses and purposes. With this done, it remains to be recorded that whilst the physical and psychological reaction of Goethe's works pertains to the first, i. e. Italian type,—dark and soft quality of voice, combined with an abdominal strain which consists in the horizontal arching of the abdomen,—Shakespeare has been found [1] to belong to the second, i. e. French type, wherein the voice is clear and soft, and the strain is thoracic, with the upper part of the body arched forward in a military position. Goethe cannot be read without an effect of discomfort and parody in the normal, erect manner of Shakespeare, nor vice versa. Within these limits the subtype varies according to the dramatic, lyric, cold and warm feeling of the particular piece. The psychological experience of the present writer—who has offered this test *merely as registering his personal observation,*—places the debated addition to Sir Thomas More in the first class, that is, as to the contents, tested by unforced recitation on the part of him-

[1] Cf. Indogermanische Forschungen, XXVIII, 323.

self and of other experimenters. There seems to be, intrinsically, little in it of the Shakespearian persuasiveness in Mark Antony's harangue, or of any further quality found in such personal utterances as the Epilogue to The Tempest or the Sonnets, in the main. Curiously enough, it is particularly More's ' Antony-like ' harangue on fol. 9 [a] that refuses to register the Shakespearian reaction!

In fine, the tests of palaeography, chronology, ' metrics ' and of vital individuality have alike brought us to the conclusion that there are almost insurmountable difficulties in the way of the theory that in the More addition we have, to use a phrase of Heminges and Condell, a collaboration of Shakespeare's hand and heart. Nor shall we be far from the scrupulous honesty of these editors of the First Folio, if, unwilling to disown Shakespeare too readily because of an occasional Homeric nod, we proceed slowly in concentrating upon him all the generic qualities of his period, and hesitate to identify, and laud him, in passages of doubtful provenience. There is too much similarity between the present problem and the development of the Baconian theory to justify the hope that Shakespeare's more intimate connection with the play of Sir Thomas More will at all become finally discredited. But, if the initial doubts of Consul Hart [1] as to the authorship of Shakespeare have gathered momentum and begot not only the numerical and bi-literal cryptograms from Bacon's pen but also the shifting of the responsibility, successively, to Robert Burton, the Earl of Rutland, and Sir Walter Ralegh as well,[2] it is at least to be wished that the entire play of Sir Thomas More might not one day be assigned to the much-maligned William Shakespeare.

ALEXANDER GREEN.

THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY, *April 7th,* 1917.

[1] Romance of Yachting, 1848.
[2] Cf. 'Who wrote Shakespeare?' by Multum in Parvo, in Denver Tribune-Republican, 1885; Demblon, Lord Rutland est Shakespeare, Paris, 1913; and Pemberton, Shakspere and Sir Walter Ralegh, Philadelphia, 1914.

Appendix. In the quarterly review, The Library, for July, 1917, under the title of Two Pretended Autographs of Shakespeare, Sir E. M. Thompson recapitulates the microscopic analysis of his Shakespeare's

Handwriting, in an effort to prove the spuriousness of the signatures in Ovid's Metamorphoses and Montaigne's Essays. There can be but complete agreement as to the former being a clumsy forgery of the last signature on the Will of Shakespeare. With respect to the latter, however, Thompson has both underestimated the inadequacy of his comparisons and exaggerated such features as "the irregularity in the scale of the writing", "the disjointed method of inscribing the letters", "the ignorantly conceived *s*", "the impossible *p*", etc. It is feared that altogether too much has been made of setting up as a model the signatures of the Will, affording as they do evidence of physical disability, and of referring to them certain characters or formations of the Montaigne signature, as exhibiting peculiarities "due to failing strength", hence cleverly fabricated by a forger familiar with the style and practise of the former group of signatures! The argument that Shakespeare would not anticipate his death-bed handwriting when inscribing his name in his books, by no means precludes the possibility that his death-bed signature, save for the characteristic tremor, would not be radically dissimilar from that of his normal and healthy days.—A. G.

II.—THE FUNCTION AND THE DRAMATIC VALUE OF THE RECOGNITION SCENE IN GREEK TRAGEDY.

There are three fundamental emotions in dramatic art upon which the value of the separate scenes and the value of the play as a whole depend. These emotions are sympathy, suspense and surprise. No one who studies the technique of Greek tragedy can fail to be impressed by the remarkable skill with which the dramatists arouse these emotions. On the other hand, no one who studies Aristotle's treatise on dramatic technique can fail to be surprised that this master technician *apparently* does not discuss these three fundamental emotions of the theatre. Only sporadically, among the countless commentators on the Poetics, does one find a mention of these very foundations of dramatic art. We shall try to show, however, that Aristotle did know the value of sympathy, suspense and surprise; and that the value of the recognition scene is to be judged, and was judged by him, in relation to these emotions.

I.

The words ἔλεος and φόβος as employed by Aristotle in the Poetics, have been variously translated and variously explained.[1] In English, they have finally come to be universally translated "pity and fear". Aristotle employs these words ἔλεος and φόβος, not only in discussing the function of tragedy, but also in dealing with the technique of tragedy. If we leave aside for the time being the question of the function of

[1] Euanthius held that in tragedy there must be magni timores (IV, 2). The words ἔλεος and φόβος are translated respectively as follows. We find in Latin versions of the Poetics: misericordiam, miserationem, metum; in Spanish: lástima, misericordia, miedo, terror; in Italian: misericordia, commiserazione, compassione, pietà, orrore, spavento, terrore, timore; in French: pitié, compassion, peur, crainte, terreur, horreur; in German: Mitleid, Schrecken, while Lessing points out that not Schrecken, which is a sudden fear, but Furcht is the correct word; in English: pity, compassion, fear, horror, terror.

tragedy, to tell a modern dramatist that the aim of certain scenes, such as an anagnorisis combined with a peripeteia, is to arouse pity and fear,[1] is tantamount to telling him that the aim of these scenes is to arouse certain emotions which, as a dramatist, he studiously avoids calling forth. We cannot dismiss this attitude of mind with mere disdain. We must ask whether Aristotle or the modern dramatist is correct; or whether the modern man in an audience differs from the ancient Athenian. Even though we etherialize the words ἔλεος and φόβος, and divest them of their painful and morbid element, we must still ask whether, as far as dramatic art is concerned, the words "pity and fear" always express the exact shade of meaning whenever ἔλεος and φόβος are employed by Aristotle.

Aristotle's definition of tragedy is, at the same time, a description of the function of tragedy and a justification of its right to exist. Plato would banish tragedians from his ideal republic because they caused people to give way to dangerous emotions, one of which is pity. "For", he says, "the reflection is not often made that from the evil of others the fruit of evil is reaped by ourselves, or that the feeling of pity which has been nursed, and has acquired strength at the sight of the misfortunes of others, will come out in our own misfortunes and cannot easily be controlled".[2] Plutarch says that, according to Aristotle, certain women were childless because of their passions of fear and grief.[3] Whether this be Aristotle or merely Aristotelian tradition, we have excellent evidence that pity and fear were regarded as dangerous emotions. Whereas Plato would forbid the production of tragedy because it arouses emotions, Aristotle wished to justify the existence of tragedy by insisting that the function of tragedy is to arouse and to purge the mind of ἔλεος and φόβος. It is not difficult to believe that these words would have been almost forced upon Aristotle by contemporary discussions of drama, even if he had preferred not to employ them in his discussion of tragedy. When Aristotle has justified the existence of tragedy on the ground that it purges the mind of

[1] 1452 a 38.
[2] Plato, Republic, X, 606, Jowett's translation.
[3] Plutarch, III, 178.

ἔλεος and φόβος, then, as a logician, he was practically forced to employ these words in dealing with the technique of tragedy in order not to shift his ground and in order to prove his case. Thus confusion arises, for while the dramatist can understand the argument of Aristotle concerning the function of tragedy, if he keeps in mind Plato's attack on tragedy, the dramatist feels that when Aristotle is discussing the technical value of certain scenes, as arousing pity and fear, he really means emotions akin to those expressed by these words, namely, sympathy and suspense.

Aristotle defines ἔλεος and φόβος in the Poetics as follows: "Nor on the other hand should an extremely bad man be seen falling from happiness into misery. Such a story may arouse the human feeling in us (φιλάνθρωπον); but it will not move us either to pity or fear (οὔτε ἔλεον οὔτε φόβον); pity is occasioned by undeserved misfortune, and fear by that of one like ourselves." [1] In a note on 1456 a 21, Bywater says: "Aristotle's theory is that the tragic situation should be ἐλεεινόν— which implies that the sufferer does not deserve his misfortunes; ... he incidentally admits, however, that it may be only φιλάνθρωπον, ... as it is, for instance, when the sufferings of the wicked are put before us in such a way as to arouse a certain commiseration or human feeling for the sufferers. The later Tragedy would seem to have affected this inferior tragic motive." We do not agree with Bywater when he says in a note to 1452 b 38 that this feeling of commiseration even for the wicked in misfortune is not, however, "pity proper, since it lacks the moral basis of all pity, the belief that the misfortune is not deserved." We must insist that in the language of the modern dramatist the sufferings of the wicked hero, such as Richard III or Hedda Gabler, arouse pity, through human feeling, and not sympathy, through fellow feeling. In the second place, undeserved misfortune "brought upon the hero not by vice and depravity but by some error of judgment" arouses sympathy. Indeed, Aristotle's ideal tragic hero and the heroes of most of the extant Greek tragedies are what dramatists call "sympathetic characters". Aristotle further defines ἔλεος in the Rhetoric as "a sort of pain at an evident evil of a destructive or painful kind in the case of

[1] 1453 a 1. The Poetics is cited in Bywater's translation.

somebody who does not deserve it, the evil being one which *we* might expect to happen to *ourselves* or some of our friends and this at a time when it is near at hand."[1] This definition, and especially the idea that the evil might happen to ourselves, leads us to believe that, in the language of the modern dramatic critic, ἔλεος means "sympathy" and not "pity", because, as Crabbe says, "pity, though a tender sentiment, is so closely allied to contempt that an ingenious mind is always loath to be the object of it."[2] "It galls us to be pitied", says the Century Dictionary. "Sympathy (feeling or suffering with)", says the Standard Dictionary, "implies some degree of equality, kindred or union; pity is for what is weak or unfortunate, and in so far at least inferior to ourselves; hence pity is often resented where sympathy would be welcome". It seems pretty plain from these definitions, and especially from the ideas of union, kindred and fellow-feeling for people like ourselves contained in both the Greek and English, that ἔλεος means "sympathy" and not "pity". In Sophocles' Electra, Chrysothemis arouses pity, but Electra arouses sympathy, and it is needless to say that the sympathetic character is the heroine. There is certainly nothing sacrosanct in the traditional translation of ἔλεος as "pity"; and, however the word may be translated, unless the modern dramatic critic knows that Aristotle employs the word in certain cases where the critic would use "sympathy", not "pity", the Poetics is going to remain unintelligible to him in these passages.

As for the word φόβος, which, as Bywater points out in a note on 1452 b 32, means the "expectation of coming evil", we must insist that in the language of dramatic critics "the expectation of coming evil" is "suspense". Although it may be objected that "suspense" is a weaker word than "fear", yet it is fear which causes suspense. Bywater adds: "The distinction between the φοβερά and ἐλεεινά in a play may be seen in the Oedipus Tyrannus, in which we are gradually prepared for the piteous incidents of the catastrophe by a series of premonitions of coming evil in the earlier scenes." It would be difficult to give a better explanation of the manner in which a playwright arouses suspense.

[1] II 8, 1385 b 13, Welldon's translation.
[2] Crabbe, English Synonyms.

Having gone thus far, we freely admit that the words 'sympathy and suspense" will not apply entirely in Aristotle's definition of the deed of horror (1453 b). Here it is not a question of suspense; but surely it is not begging the question to say that, in this passage, Aristotle is discussing how to increase the horror, not the fear, in the situation. The fact that Oedipus is the son of Jocasta, or that Orestes is the brother of Iphigenia, increases the horror of the situation, but it does not increase our dramatic suspense, our fear that the situation may have a tragic outcome. Certainly no one will argue that ἔλεος and φόβος refer to emotions in the heart of the spectator, who, beholding Oedipus, selfishly pities himself, and fears that a similar misfortune may befall himself. Surely such a painful and inartistic function of tragedy did not enter Aristotle's mind.

II.

In order to clear the field fully for a discussion of the function and the dramatic value of anagnorisis, we must investigate the third important element in dramatic technique, namely, surprise, for we cannot separate surprise from suspense in any discussion of the technique of the drama.

Perhaps the most vital law which Aristotle laid down in regard to the technique of tragedy is the law of the probable or necessary sequence of events. As he says: "There is a great difference between a thing happening *propter hoc* and *post hoc*."[1] Furthermore he makes the following significant statement: "Tragedy, however, is an imitation not only of a complete action but also of incidents arousing pity and fear (sympathy and suspense). Such incidents have the very greatest effect on the mind when they occur unexpectedly and at the same time in consequence of one another."[2] Bywater comments on this passage as follows: "At this point Aristotle recognizes a new element of interest in tragedy, the element of surprise, but only incidentally in order to bring it under the canon of construction laid down in chap. 7. The φοβερὰ καὶ ἐλεεινά of Tragedy, he says, have the very greatest effect on the mind when they come in unexpectedly, but at the same time as the natural or necessary consequence of the incidents

[1] 1452 a 20.   [2] 1452 a 1.

within the play itself." Twining comments: "The effect of
surprise when combined with Pity or Terror, is to add force
to those latter passions which necessarily predominate in the
combination and to raise the whole to a higher pitch." We
may add that the element of surprise increases laughter, for
humor depends upon the incongruous and the unexpected.
Surprise produces a mental shock. Thus a scene of suspense,
either tragic or comic, ending with a surprising turn of an
unexpected development is of greater dramatic value than a
scene of suspense which turns out about as one anticipates.
The great power of the Oedipus Rex as a play on the stage
depends, to a large extent, on the fact that almost everything
turns out contrary to both our hope and expectations; and
yet, at the same time, analysis shows that the causal sequence
of events is inevitable. The handling in this manner of scenes
of suspense ending with a surprise, but still in necessary
sequence, makes this play perhaps the most perfect piece of
dramatic technique in existence.

Aristotle also brings the element of surprise into his dis-
cussion of the deed of horror.[1] After mentioning two situa-
tions in which there is no possible surprise, he says: "A
better situation than that, however, is for the deed to be done
in ignorance, and the relationship to be discovered afterwards,
since there is nothing odious in it and the Discovery will
serve to astound us." Also the situation which he considers
the best one contains the same element of surprise, the only
difference between the two scenes being that in the latter the
recognition occurs before the accomplishment of the deed.
Bywater comments in part: "The Discovery is said both here
and in 16, 1455 a 17 to be 'astounding', just in the same
way as a περιπέτεια—which in a play is so intimately connected
with the Discovery—is said in Rhet. i. 11, 1371 b 10 to be
θαυμαστόν." This note leads us to 1455 a 17 which reads: "The
best of all Discoveries, however, is that arising from the inci-
dents themselves, when the great surprise comes about through
a probable incident." Also, as the note suggests, peripeteia
is intimately connected with anagnorisis and is said to be
θαυμαστόν.

Now as Greek tragedies are constructed, the peripeteia cer-
tainly contains the element of surprise. The fact that the

[1] 1454 a ff.

Oedipus Rex was undeniably a play which appealed very strongly to Aristotle is extremely significant. During the anagnorisis he must have been in great dramatic suspense and this suspense was only ended by the peripeteia—in this case a *coup de théâtre* ushered in with a dramatic shock of surprise. This is a situation desired by every dramatist, namely, to arouse suspense and then to have the unexpected happen through a complete reversal. This explains why Aristotle insisted upon the value of this scene in the Oedipus Rex. The anagnorisis was not dramatic because it was a recognition scene, but because it aroused suspense. The peripeteia was dramatic because it ended that suspense with a wholly surprising turn of events.

Thus it seems that Aristotle felt the value of the three great dramatic emotions: sympathy, suspense, and surprise. Now let us see what is the function and the dramatic value of anagnorisis, basing our discussion upon the relation of the recognition scenes to these emotions, which are the very soul of all drama. Thus, and only thus, can we judge the merit of anagnorisis in Greek tragedy, or, indeed, in any form of drama.

III.

Aristotle divides anagnorisis into three general classes.[1] 1. Anagnorisis which may occur "in reference to inanimate things". Although he does not give an example of this form, it may be pointed out that the recognition by Neoptolemus of the belongings of Philoctetes falls into this class. 2. Anagnorisis as to whether some one has or has not done something. Again we may supply as an example the anagnorisis on the part of Theseus that Phaedra has committed suicide. 3. The anagnorisis of persons, which, he says, is most directly connected with the plot. This is a statement which must be questioned, since the mutual recognition of Orestes and Iphigenia is no more directly connected with the plot than is the discovery by Theseus that Phaedra has taken her own life.

The anagnorisis of persons is divided by Aristotle into five classes in order of ascending merit.

[1] 1452 a 34.

1. Anagnorisis by tokens or marks:

    a. Tokens or marks disclosed by chance. (Odysseus by Eurycleia.)

    b. Tokens or marks disclosed purposely. (Odysseus by the swineherd.)

2. Anagnorisis by self-disclosure. (Orestes reveals himself to Iphigenia.)

3. Anagnorisis through memory from a man's consciousness being awakened by something seen or heard. (Tale of Alcinoüs.)

4. Anagnorisis through reasoning:

    a. Good reasoning. (Orestes by Electra in the Choephoroe.)

    b. Bad reasoning. (Odysseus, the False Messenger.)

5. Anagnorisis arising from the incidents themselves when the great surprise comes about through a probable incident, like that in the Oedipus Rex of Sophocles, and also in the Iphigenia.

Professor Perrin, in an article entitled Recognition Scenes in Greek literature [1] has attacked the problem of the relative merit of the recognition scenes from the point of view set forth by Aristotle in his classification. Professor Perrin reaches the following conclusion: " We have seen, then, that of Aristotle's five classes of recognitions, three—the second, third, and fourth—must fall away as non-exclusive; and that the principle of directness or indirectness in conveying proofs of personal identity, admitted to be important by Aristotle, must be made supreme as a principle of classification. Recognitions of the highest art are the result of proof of identity conveyed indirectly, preferably without the use of signs and tokens, although by no means necessarily so." [2]

Professor Perrin classifies recognitions as follows:

    I. Spontaneous, without " delay ", without proof.

    II. Induced by proof.

        A. Direct and formal by means of signs.

        B. Indirect, informal and artistic.

            a. By means of signs.

            b. Without the use of signs.

[1] American Journal of Philology, XXV (1909), 371 ff.
[2] Op. cit., pp. 403-4.

Interesting as his discussion is Professor Perrin has not investigated the one vital problem for the dramatist, namely, the function and the dramatic value of the recognition scene. The Poetics is, in part, a treatise on playwrighting; and to analyse these scenes as separate entities, not as parts of the whole framework of the play, is to discuss only a part of the problem. Professor Perrin designates the indirect, informal recognition as "artistic". Would he be willing to substitute the word "dramatic"? If so, what makes these scenes dramatic? What emotions do they arouse, and how do they arouse these emotions? These are the questions which interest the dramatist; and these are the questions we shall attempt to answer. We shall not try to formulate any hard and fast classification of recognition scenes; but we shall have something to say in regard to Professor Perrin's classification, for, in spite of the fact that he has brought valid objections to Aristotle's classification, we do not feel that his own is impervious to criticism.

Over against Aristotle's statement that "a Discovery using signs as a means of assurance is less artistic, as indeed are all such as imply reflexion"[1] we may set Professor Perrin's statement that "recognitions of the highest art are the result of proof conveyed indirectly, preferably without the use of signs and tokens, although by no means necessarily so".[2] The dramatist, however, will not accept either of these views. Of course, both in tragedy and in comedy, jewels, or tokens of any kind, which have been placed with a lost child and serve as proof of identity years later, are likely to impress one as having been "planted" on purpose by the playwright —if we may borrow an expressive term from the underworld. However, any recognition scene presupposes concealed identity, and plots constructed upon such a situation are likely to be considered as inartistic by the modern critic. On generally accepted canons of taste, we might be tempted to discard the whole procedure as inartistic, were it not for the fact that to say that any dramatic situation is inartistic, irrespective of the way it is handled, is dangerously dogmatic. Therefore, for this very reason, to say that proof of identity conveyed indi-

[1] 1454 b 28.   [2] Loc. cit.

rectly is the best form of anagnorisis is to be dangerously
and unnecessarily dogmatic. If one considers Balzac's Colo-
nel Chabert, or Arnold Bennett's Buried Alive, one realizes
that, both in Balzac's tragic situation and in Bennett's comic
situation, the interest arises from the very fact that the direct
formal proof of the hero's identity is very difficult. In both
of these cases, the problem is to make not only formal proof
but legal proof; and to hold that the production of such proof
is less artistic than to have the hero convey the proof of his
identity indirectly, is to make the word artistic depend upon a
negligible technicality. No dramatist will admit that a scene
in which direct proof of identity is demanded and given is
foreordained to be less dramatic than a scene of indirect
proof. And for the playwright, the dramatic is the artistic.

Furthermore, when Professor Perrin places the recognition
of Odysseus by Penelope in his class of indirect, informal, and
artistic recognition scenes, we doubt the entire validity of his
classification. Penelope stubbornly refuses to believe in the
identity of Odysseus; but she finally says to Eurycleia : " Make
up his massive bed outside that stately chamber which he
himself once built. Move the massive frame outside." Then
Homer adds : " She said this to prove her husband." It makes
little difference whether Odysseus knows that she is cleverly
putting him to the test. She is demanding proof. The situa-
tion is very different from the recognition of Iphigenia by
Orestes in which the proof is conveyed indirectly when Iphi-
genia, with no *arrière pensée* whatsoever, gives the letter to
Pylades; but Penelope knows that she is testing Odysseus.
She, the cunning Greek, is tacitly doing the same thing
with Odysseus which Professor Perrin criticizes Iphigenia, a[1]
cunning Greek, for doing openly when she doubts the identity
of Orestes. She is demanding formal proof. Yet, Professor
Perrin places the recognition of Odysseus by Penelope and
the recognition of Iphigenia by Orestes in the same artistic
class, whereas he relegates the recognition of Orestes by
Iphigenia to a less artistic class. We fail to see that the fact
that Orestes knows that he is being put to a test by Iphigenia
and that Odysseus does not know that Penelope " said this to
prove her husband ", makes the latter situation more artistic
than the former.

19

Thus we regard the classifications, both of Aristotle and of Professor Perrin, as being rather unimportant. The means by which the recognition is brought about cannot be judged by any abstract so-called artistic considerations. They must be judged by concrete considerations depending upon the particular dramatic considerations at hand.

We find confirmation for this point of view when Aristotle makes the categorical statement, without mentioning the means by which the recognition is brought about, that "the finest form of discovery is one attended by Peripeties like that which goes with the Discovery in Oedipus . . . . This, with a Peripety, will arouse either pity or fear [sympathy or suspense]—actions of that nature being what Tragedy is assumed to represent".[1]

This statement is also significant because it gives evidence that anagnorisis was felt by Aristotle to be of dramatic value, since, combined with a peripeteia, it arouses the three dramatic emotions: sympathy, suspense, and surprise. Furthermore, Aristotle says: "A Discovery using signs as a means of assurance is less artistic as indeed are all such as imply reflection; whereas one bringing them in all of a sudden (ἐκ περιπετείας), as in the Bath story, is of a better order."[2] He had said before, in dealing with the deed of horror: "A better situation than that, however, is for the deed to be done in ignorance and the relationship discovered afterwards, since there is nothing odious in it, and the *Discovery will serve to astound us.*"[3] Finally, we may quote the following words: "The best of all Discoveries, however, is that arising from the incidents themselves, when the *great surprise* comes about through a

[1] 1452 a 32 ff.

[2] 1454 b 28 ff. We agree with Bywater in regard to the translation of ἐκ περιπετείας following Victorius, "repentino quodam casu". Bywater rejects Tyrwhitt: "quae ex peripeteia oriuntur", claiming that Aristotle is not using the word in a technical sense. Moore also translates it "suddenly or unexpectedly" and cites Ritter "ex inopinato casu". Twining gives: "suddenly and casually" and cites Victorius: "sed ἐκ περιπετείας significat casu fortuito, et quia ita cecidit. Heinsius says: "quae e mutationibus in contrarium oriuntur. Butcher's "turn of incident" and Lane Cooper's "turn of events" are unsatisfactory because they are somewhat indefinite.

[3] 1454 a 2 ff.

probable incident." [1]   It seems very plain from these passages
that, in Aristotle's opinion, the dramatic value of anagnorisis,
combined with a peripeteia, depends upon the fact that it
arouses sympathy, suspense, and surprise.   We shall now try
to show that this is the dramatic value possessed, in varying
degree, by all the recognition scenes in Greek Tragedy.

IV.

No one will deny that there is a difference in dramatic value
between the recognition scene in the Helen and the scene in
the Oedipus Rex.   However, to describe the anagnorisis in
the Helen as " spontaneous, without delay, without proof " and
the anagnorisis in the Oedipus Rex as "indirect, informal and
artistic", is rather meaningless to the dramatist. [2]   Moreover,
if we understand correctly the meaning of the terms Professor
Perrin uses in regard to the recognition scene in the Helen,
it seems that we must remove the scene from this class.
Helen, after believing Menelaus to be dead, hears from Theonoe
that he lives.   Menelaus arrives at Pharos, accompanied by a
woman whom he believes to be the real Helen; but he is in-
formed that Helen is at Pharos.   This arouses suspense as to
whether the husband and wife will meet.   At last, they face
each other.   This increases the suspense, the question now
being, whether they will recognize each other.   Both are
struck by the resemblance; but Euripides does not allow the
suspense to end by any "spontaneous" recognition, as he does
in his Electra when Orestes is recognized by a minor char-
acter, the Paedagogue.   When the hero and heroine carry on
the recognition scene, Euripides is far too clever a dramatist
to allow the chance to escape of playing the note of suspense
by failing to delay the anagnorisis.   Helen flees toward the
tomb.   Menelaus drags her back.   They scan each other once
more.   Do they both recognize each other?   Not yet.   Helen
is convinced; but Menelaus says:

> What makes me doubt
> Is this; because I have another wife.

[1] 1455 a 16.   Aristotle does not contradict himself here in regard to
the " best " Discovery.   He is speaking of the way in which the Dis-
covery is made, whereas in 1452 a 32, he is discussing Discovery in
general.

[2] Perrin, loc. cit.

Helen tries to convince him of her identity, saying:

> To the domain of Troy I never went:
> It was my image only.

But that statement is not proof for Menelaus. Finally come the lines:

> *Helen.*   Will you then leave me here, and bear away
>   The shadow of a wife?
> *Men.*   Yet, O farewell,
>   Because thou art like Helen.

Menelaus refuses all the evidence and arguments that Helen has to offer; and he is about to leave. Surely there is plenty of "delay" in the scene. More delay would be perilously near overdoing this means of arousing suspense. Finally, when the audience almost despairs of a happy outcome, a messenger brings evidence which constitutes proof for Menelaus, if not for Professor Perrin.[1] This proof lies in the fact that the other Helen has vanished, saying:

> . . . . but Tyndarus' miserable daughter,
> Though guiltless, hath unjustly been accused.

This dispels Menelaus' doubt which certainly delayed his recognition of Helen, and aroused much suspense. This scene calls forth sympathy, especially for Helen, and undeniable suspense, which would not have been aroused were both recognitions "spontaneous, without delay, and without proof", as Professor Perrin claims they are. There is not much surprise for the spectators, because Euripides has prepared for the scene,[2] and one expects a husband and wife to recognize each other. Nothing happens finally contrary to our expectations. The function of the scene, so far as the plot is concerned, is to act as the exciting incident of the action, or the incident which sets the action in motion. The real plot of the play is based upon the question: Can the wedded pair escape?

---

[1] Op. cit., p. 399.

[2] Euripides indulges in false foreshadowing when he has Helen say:

> Were my husband living
> We might have known each other, by producing
> Those tokens to which none beside are privy.

Tokens are not used as proof in this scene.

In the Oedipus Rex we have an example of an anagnorisis combined with a peripeteia—a situation upon which Aristotle put his unqualified stamp of approval. There is no finer technical handling of a scene in all dramatic art. The plot of the play rests upon the attempt to solve the question as to whether the murderer of Laius can be discovered. Sophocles has not told us the real identity of Oedipus, and our pre-knowledge of the story must not influence us in our technical analysis of the play. Thus, from a dramatic point of view, we believe that Oedipus is the son of Polybus and Merope. The dramatist has also taken good care to nullify partially the impression made upon the spectators by the accusation of Tiresias. The messenger comes to relieve Oedipus of his fears. In a speech full of marvelous dramatic suspense, every word the messenger utters seems to reassure us, were it not for the fact that Jocasta at last recognizes Oedipus and warns him, in words of unmistakable meaning, to inquire no further into the secret. Our suspense is perfect. Then comes the Herdsman and the recognition is complete. The disclosure arouses our deepest sympathy for the unfortunate, and almost innocent, husband and wife, son and mother. The peripeteia comes with astounding surprise, as the audience sees hope vanish before the awful truth. It is a perfect *coup de théâtre*, bringing in its wake a nerve-racking emotion. The function of the scene is to serve as climax.

This recognition scene is of greater dramatic value than the anagnorisis in the Helen for two reasons. In the first place, the suspense is ended in the Helen without surprise, whereas in the Oedipus Rex it ends with an astounding peripeteia. In the second place, the scene in the Helen comes early in the play, whereas in the Oedipus Rex it forms the climax. Also the peripeteia in the Oedipus Rex constitutes a complete and final μετάβασις; and any spectator will be more impressed by an anagnorisis ending with such a peripeteia than by one which leaves the situation capable of further development, and perhaps of a different outcome. Thus, there is little wonder that Aristotle was impressed strongly by this scene; and it is not strange, that, knowing such a moment in drama, he insisted upon the value of the recognition scene. There are other ways of arousing sympathy, suspense, and surprise

but, under the influence of this scene, Aristotle insisted so much upon the element of recognition and not enough upon the element of suspense that he misled later critics into the belief that one of the *means* of arousing sympathy and suspense was more important than the *aim* of arousing these emotions. From the analysis of the situation in this play we can see why he approved of the recognition scenes: because they sometimes brought him to the highest pitch of emotion, and not because one person was recognizing another spontaneously or through direct or indirect proof.

The anagnorisis in the Iphigenia in Tauris is plainly one which calls forth sympathy for the brother and sister and arouses suspense in regard to their fate. Iphigenia, more than willing to sacrifice a Greek, confronts Orestes and begins to question him about her family. One thinks that such leading questions will bring out the truth; but the dramatist avoids putting an end to our suspense and, indeed, stresses the hopelessness of the situation, as is correct in a play with an unhappy ending.[1] Indeed, Iphigenia, after failing to discover who Orestes is, leaves the stage, thus deepening the sorrow of the audience and delaying the anagnorisis. Only one possibility of escape seems open to Orestes: that he deliver the letter. Even that possibility fades away completely when Pylades consents to act as messenger. At this point in the action nothing remains for Orestes but death. But then comes a surprise, not so astounding as in the Oedipus Rex, but still a surprise. With all hope seemingly gone Iphigenia, all of a sudden (ἐκ περιπετείας) bids Pylades deliver

---

[1] The Greek dramatists are such masters of the art of arousing suspense and causing surprise that, as a general rule, they stress the note of fear in a play with a happy ending, such as Iphigenia in Tauris and the Ion; whereas they stress the note of hope in plays with an unhappy ending, such as the Oedipus Rex and the Agamemnon. It is probably for this reason that the rule was laid down by later critics, such as Euanthius, and was accepted by the Renaissance critics, that tragedy should have a calm beginning and an unhappy ending, whereas comedy should have a turbulent beginning and a calm ending. Thus Ibsen, who follows the technique of Greek tragedy more closely than any other modern dramatist, begins The Doll's House and Rosmersholm with a peaceful scene.

the letter "to Orestes", and Orestes recognizes Iphigenia.[1]
But Euripides knows how to create suspense, and also how to
hold it. Orestes calls Iphigenia, "My sister", but she re-
plies: "My brother! Thou my brother? Wilt thou not
unsay those words?" Of course she demands formal proofs.
Would anyone do anything else under these circumstances?
Is there not every reason for Iphigenia to suspect that this
man, who claims to be her brother, is employing a clever ruse
to escape death? Professor Perrin says that the "proof is
not wrung from him by artful stratagem . . . . . but is drawn
out in wearisome cumulation."[2] But do we expect that under
such an emotional shock a sister is going to pull herself to-
gether and devise some artful stratagem in order that the
second anagnorisis may be placed in the "artistic" class?
Surely such a procedure is not true to life; nor is it true to
dramatic art. Euripides has played one theatrical trick, and
has played it so well that it becomes an excellent *coup de
théâtre.* Shall we ask him to devise still another one? A
Scribe might have done so; but Euripides is not Scribe.
When such devices, as that of the letter in Iphigenia in
Tauris, are repeated in the same scene, they become what
Henry Arthur Jones justly calls "thimblerigging", and the
audience becomes painfully conscious of the dramatist's pen.
The play becomes false to life and false to high art. Indeed,
it is greatly to the credit of Euripides that, having employed
one indirect proof without the use of signs, he immediately
varies the method and has formal proof demanded Variety
is the spice of drama as well as of life. The suspense and
interest of the audience are greatly heightened by the very fact
that Iphigenia demands formal proofs. We wonder whether
Orestes can produce them.

Certainly we cannot say that this scene produces pity and
fear. It brings us into full sympathy with the hero and

[1] No spectator would possibly have time during the on-rush of the
action to figure out that Iphigenia will have to tell the name of the
person to whom the letter is to be sent, and that thus Orestes will
recognize her.

[2] Op. cit., p. 397. We can only reply that the scene given in Mr.
Granville Barker's production of the play was full of suspense and by
no means wearisome. The dialogue at this point moves with great
swiftness. The final test of a scene is the impression it makes upon an
audience in a theatre, not upon the individual critic at his desk.

heroine. The fear that it produces is simply the element of fear that enters into all suspense. When the scene is over, the fear on the part of the audience is much lessened. Orestes is saved from one danger, for there is a peripeteia attendant upon this anagnorisis; but the problem of Orestes' escape is not solved. The ânagnorisis in the Iphigenia in Tauris neither sets the action in motion, as it does in the Helen, nor does it serve as climax, as it does in the Oedipus Rex. The scene is a step in the development of the plot.

In the Ion the principal anagnorisis is delayed until the end of the play since the problem presented by the plot is whether Creusa must remain childless. The function of this recognition scene is to serve as dénouement, as it does in New Comedy, for the play is practically over the moment that Creusa recognizes Ion. The first scene, early in the play, in which Creusa questions Ion, immediately arouses suspense; and, as it is a possible recognition scene, in which the recognition does not take place, we fear throughout the whole tragedy that Creusa may never recognize Ion as her son, especially as Ion himself forbids her to question Apollo in regard to her son. A scene of this kind differs from real anagnorisis only in the fact that the recognition is not accomplished. It arouses the same sympathy and suspense, but it simply does not end the suspense. This scene in the Ion performs the function of exposition in an excellent manner because the best form of exposition is to unfold the situation during a scene of suspense.

Also, we have in this play another kind of anagnorisis, not mentioned by Aristotle, namely, a false recognition by Xuthus of Ion as his son. This leads to further complication of the plot as it causes the intention on the part of Creusa to slay Ion. This complication, in turn, causes the intention on the part of Ion to kill Creusa. This situation, together with the recognition, constitutes practically one of the best dramatic situations according to Aristotle, who holds that the best handling of the deed of horror is one in which some one is on the point of slaying another in ignorance of the relationship and makes the discovery in time to draw back.[1] It is the Pythian Priestess who holds back the hand of Ion, but the

[1] 1454 a 4.

recognition of Ion by Creusa comes a moment later when the Priestess discloses to the mother's view the wicker chest in which the mother had placed the child at birth. Thus the effect of the scene is like the effect of the situation of which Aristotle approves so highly. These two recognition scenes are parallel to the recognition scenes in the Iphigenia in Tauris, for naturally Ion demands formal proof of his mother's identity. Professor Perrin comments: "There is scarcely a doubt that both scenes were popular with Athenian audiences, which enjoyed play and counter-play of cunning; but the element of directness in the elongated proof robs them of a high artistic excellence ".[1] But the real question is whether the element of elongated proof robs them of dramatic excellence. Do these scenes arouse less suspense because a direct proof is required? For reasons stated above we cannot admit it. As in the recognition scene of Orestes by Iphigenia, it seems both natural and good technically for Ion to demand direct formal proof and that for him to do otherwise would be false psychologically. Perhaps again a Scribe could have devised some "artful stratagem" for Ion to employ so that the scene could be placed in the "artistic" class; but if, as Professor Perrin admits, the highly intelligent Athenian audience enjoyed the scene, and since the scene is certainly not untrue to life, what more can one demand?[2]

[1] Op. cit., p. 401.

[2] It may seem that I imply by these statements that the recognition of Odysseus by Penelope is inartistic and false psychologically; but the situations are not entirely similar. In the Odyssey, Odysseus has not suddenly recognized Penelope through any indirect means and has not straightway burst forth upon her with the claim of his identity, in which case she would probably have said, as do Ion and Iphigenia: "Prove it!" Homer takes good care to tell us that Penelope is dazed, having awakened from a sound sleep. He insists that she cannot speak because she is dazed with wonder. Were the situation exactly parallel to the situation in the Iphigenia in Tauris and the Ion, and had Homer employed indirect proof for both recognitions, he would have been in great danger of indulging in Scribian legerdemain and "thimble-rigging". But the situations are not similar; and, whatever we may think of direct or indirect proof, the technical and hence the artistic problem changes when *two* recognitions are necessary in the same scene. In no extant Greek tragedy does a dramatist employ the same method for two recognitions.

Professor Perrin says of the recognition of Electra by Orestes in the Choephoroe: "Orestes conjectures Electra from her issuing out of the palace at the head of a company of slaves, and his conjecture becomes a certainty when he overhears her prayers for her brother's return. This is indirect and highly artistic proof (ἐξ αὐτῶν τῶν πραγμάτων) . . . ."[1] This statement is not in accordance with the facts in the case. What really happens is that Orestes, having placed a votive lock of hair on his father's tomb, sees the procession of the maidens come forth and asks if they come "to sooth the ancient anger of the dead with sweet libations for my father's tomb". He answers his own question: "'Tis even so: for lo! Electra comes." There is not a shadow of doubt in the words of Orestes. He sees his sister and recognizes her "spontaneously, without delay and without proof", as Professor Perrin would have said had he been more attentive to the real situation. The scene must, therefore, be removed from the classification of "indirect, informal and artistic, without the use of signs", in which it is placed by Professor Perrin. However, the scene has a dramatic value of bringing a pleasurable surprise and of arousing suspense for the next scene. The recognition takes place so quickly that there is little time for suspense during the anagnorisis.

The recognition of Orestes by Electra has been criticized as inartistic from Euripides down to the modern critic. It is true that the signs, the hair and the footprint, are somewhat naïve and lend themselves easily to burlesque; but the scene is dramatic. We grant the naïveté resident in the likeness of the hair and the footprints of the brother and sister, yet the proof is produced in accordance with the law of probable or necessary sequence of events. We know that Orestes is near at hand and that the signs are at the tomb as Electra approaches. We hope that she will recognize them. We undergo suspense; and when she discovers them and, through them, the identity of Orestes, we are in full sympathy with the brother and sister. We certainly do not pity them.

Also we find another recognition scene in this play, which Professor Perrin does not mention, when Clytaemnestra recognizes Orestes. The first time that they face each other

[1] Op. cit., p. 386.

the recognition does not take place, but we are in great sus-
pense lest Clytaemnestra discover the identity of her son.
Finally, however, Clytaemnestra comes to the awful realiza-
tion that the stranger, who has brought the news of the death
of Orestes, is Orestes himself, her son. Clytaemnestra enters
and says to the wailing servant:

> Cly. Well! what's the matter? why this clamorous cry?
> Serv. He, who was dead, has slain the quick. 'Tis so.
> Cly. Ha! Thou speakest riddles; but I understand thee.

This is a dramatic moment of tremendous emotional shock;
and this recognition performs the important function of
leading to the great obligatory scene and climax of the play,
when Orestes enters quickly and faces his mother. Who cares
to analyze the scene to see how Clytaemnestra came to the
conclusion by a process of reasoning: "Some one has slain
Aegisthus. The only one who would slay Aegisthus is
Orestes. Hence, this stranger is Orestes". The manner of
the recognition is entirely unimportant. We will say, how-
ever, that the swiftness and directness of the recognition at
this point in the action is drama of the highest art. The
anagnorisis has already been delayed up to this moment; but
further delay for the sake of suspense, just before the obliga-
tory scene, would be most inartistic and undramatic. This
recognition scene is a wonderful *coup de théâtre* expressed in
three lines.

In the Euripidean version of this play it is true, as Pro-
fessor Perrin says, that Orestes learns the identity of Electra
from her words of lamentation. When Electra enters,
Orestes believes her to be a slave; and he withdraws for a
moment, with the intention of questioning her later. Over-
hearing her lament, he recognizes her. Professor Perrin
calls this recognition of her identity "indirect and artistic".[1]
It is certainly indirect, but there is scarcely anything more
inartistic in drama than for a character to gain information
by overhearing a monologue. This method of bringing about a
recognition is to be criticized adversely far more than the
method employed by Aeschylus in the same situation, which
Professor Perrin says is so "artificial as to be ridiculous".[2]

[1] Op. cit., p. 404.
[2] Op. cit., p. 387.

We can see very plainly, however, throughout the whole scene
in the Electra, the technique of the more sophisticated dra-
matist, Euripides.   When Orestes has recognized Electra, the
playwright holds back the recognition of Orestes by Electra
as long as possible, and he wrings the last drop of suspense
from the situation.   Orestes meets Electra, but does not dis-
close his identity even after he is sure of Electra's state of
mind.   At last, after the scenes with Auturgus and after a
choral ode, the old paedagogue is brought in and he quickly
recognizes Orestes.   Electra naturally demands proofs.   Hav-
ing seen and talked with the man beforehand, it would be
strange if she suddenly became convinced without proof.
Where Aeschylus is brief, Euripides is long because he has
learned the value of suspense.   The recognition of Orestes by
Clytaemnestra in this play is behind the scenes.   Thus
Euripides misses an obligatory scene.

In the Sophoclean version of the story the emotional and
dramatic value of the scene is greatly increased by the fact
that Electra has been led to believe by the story of the Paeda-
gogue that Orestes is dead.   The audience, however, knows
that he is living and that he has gone to Agamemnon's tomb.
Thus, when Crysothemis hurries to Electra with the glad
tidings that Orestes lives and that he has placed a votive
offering on the tomb, the audience expects Electra to believe
her; but Electra, impressed by the report of the death of
Orestes, refutes her story.   When Orestes places in Electra's
hands the urn supposedly containing his own ashes, the audi-
ence awaits the recognition more breathlessly than it does in
the versions of Aeschylus and Euripides.   In the Sophoclean
version each of the principal characters is ignorant of the
other's identity and thus there is a strong possibility that the
recognition may not take place; whereas in the other versions,
Orestes has already recognized Electra and the recognition of
Orestes is only a matter of time.   Also, in the Sophoclean
play, the audience awaits with pleasurable expectation the joy
of Electra when she finds that Orestes is alive.   The scene is
difficult to equal in its suspense and sympathy.   It rises in
perfect gradation of intensity to the climax, when Orestes,
convinced by Electra's grief of her identity, discloses himself.

The scenes in the three versions perform somewhat different
functions in regard to the plot.   In the Choephoroe, the func-

tion is least important. As Professor Perrin says, the recognition scene in this tragedy is "a mere preliminary leading up to the all absorbing crisis of matricide".[1] In the other plays the anagnorisis is so developed as to become an integral part of the plot. It is the scene from which the smouldering motive of revenge bursts into flame.

In the Bacchae and in the Hercules Furens there are recognition scenes which have not been discussed by Professor Perrin, but which are very important because they are connected with the second best method of handling the deed of horror according to Aristotle. The deed is done in ignorance and the relationship is discovered afterwards. Thus there is nothing odious in it and "the Discovery will serve to astound us".[2] Thus in the Bacchae, Agave slays Pentheus in ignorance and then discovers that he is her son. In the Hercules Furens, Hercules slays his wife and children and discovers their identity afterwards. It cannot be argued that there is no element of surprise whatsoever in these scenes because the audience knows the identity of the slain people. The spectators undergo the emotions of the hero in a well written play. When the audience realizes that Agave and Hercules may recognize the dead children, sympathy is aroused, suspense is created and the astounding discovery made by Agave and Hercules finds a response in the heart of the spectator.

V.

Thus the anagnorisis in these plays arouses in varying degree of intensity the three great emotions of dramatic art: sympathy, suspense, and surprise. If anyone believes that this is inevitably the case with the recognition scene, one has only to turn to comedy in which the anagnorisis is merely a device to bring about a happy ending. There may be some slight element of surprise in the discovery of relationship in comedy; but certainly the anagnorisis in comedy is not consciously and purposely employed to arouse sympathy or suspense or surprise as it is in tragedy. Also, in Terence, the recognition scene is so unimportant that it sometimes occurs behind the scenes, as in the Eunuchus, Heautontimoroumenos, and

[1] Op. cit., p. 395.   [2] 1453 b.

Hecyra; or it is practically narrated, as in the Phormio, or is between the wrong characters as in the Andria.

Thus the recognition scene in Greek tragedy performs various functions in regard to the plot, such as exposition and preparation (Choephoroe), exciting incident (Helen), a step in the development of the plot or action (Electra), climax (Oedipus Rex), dénouement (Ion). The dramatic value of anagnorisis has nothing to do with the manner in which the recognition is brought about; but the value depends upon the amount of sympathy, suspense, and surprise that it arouses, and upon the function in regard to the development of the action. We agree with Aristotle that the finest form of anagnorisis is one caused by the probable or necessary sequence of events and is combined with a peripeteia, for thus combined it will arouse the fundamental dramatic emotions: sympathy, suspense, and surprise.

DONALD CLIVE STUART.

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY.

III.—WEST GERMANIC PRETERITS WITH Ē²
FROM IE ĒI.[1]

1. One of the problems of the VIIth verbal Ablaut Series lies in the phonetic difficulty that IE ĒI was longer maintained in the preterit of certain Germanic verbs than in the present. Brugmann's solution, compactly stated in advance, is that, in the IE present LĒÍ-DETI, the open syllable LĒI yielded LĒ¹ in the Germanic primate *lē-tō (cf. OEng. infin. lætan 'to let') ; but at a later time, in the present LĒID-MI, the c l o s e d syllable LĒID- yielded Germanic *lē²t. For this assumption the only evidence is the o p e n syllable of the Germanic primate *lē²te, in OEng. p r e t e r i t lēt. The writer, who is not a Germanist, conceives the problem differently and will attempt to show, first, a fairly frequent IE alternation (here not meaning gradation) so distributed as to tense as to be susceptible to the formulation pres. ĕ : pf. ĕi (əi). He will also assume that, like reduplication and o-vocalism and special person endings, this diphthongal character may have been seized on as an earmark, by no means obligatory, of the perfect tense system. This auxiliary proposition does not require argument, for the principle is but an aspect of analogy and a like fact is already admitted as a formative principle for the weak stem in Sanskrit perfects. In Sanskrit, the weak perfect stem of the root sad is generally, and perhaps correctly, explained from SE-SD-, yielding Skr. sed-, in which e is a secondary diphthong like ɛ in ɛɩs, from IE SEMS. In Indo-Iranian the weak perfect stem yait- in Skr. yete, Av. yaēte (: yat), is derived from IE YE-YT-. From these and like etymologically justified alternations of pres. a : pf. e the Sanskrit weak e-perfects are thought to have spread, almost without limit, over the entire verb system. Of course, the

[1] References. Streitberg, Urgerman. Gram.[1], § 79; § 216, 1 ; p. 371–2, Noreen, Urgerman. Lautlehre, § 10, 1. Wright, Old English Grammar, §125; §§ 511–514. Brugmann, Kurze vergleich. Gram., § 147, Anm.; Grundriss i,[2] § 226 u. Anm.; ii², 3, §403 u. Anm.

perfect stem *yait-* may really have existed as IE YEIT, so that the correlation of pres. YETE-: pf. YEIT- would have been proethnic. Sanskrit has six such roots beginning with *ya-*. Likewise the Skr. perfect *sede* might be referred to IE SƏID: the root SĒID 'to sit', as once and still set down by the authorities. So by Brugmann, Gr. i, § 549 c, and by Brugmann-Thumb, Griech. Gram.⁴, p. 332, Anm.

2. In further demonstration of IE Aˣɪ preterits (perfects): Aˣ presents I will first adduce three Sanskrit perfects, referring for the quantity of material in support of synonymous roots in Ĕ/Ĕɪ to Noreen, op. cit., § 58, 2.

   (i) 3d pl. pf. act. *çedus* 'ceciderunt': Welsh *cwyddo* 'cado', from Celtic **keidō*, see Fick-Stokes Wbch., p. 75.

   (ii) 1st sg. pf. mid. *mene* 'puto' (putavi): Germ. *meinen*.

   (iii) 1st sg. pf. mid. tene 'tetendi': ταɩ-νία 'band'.

In all three instances the Skr. *e*-perfects belong to Āˣɪ-roots, associated with Skr. *a*-roots. The Sanskrit correlation of *a*: *e* turns on roots of the type of SĒIK 'to cut' (in Lat. *sīca* 'dagger', where *īc* may come from ĒIK >*ĕik*, or contain IE Ēɪ: Əɪ/ī): SEK (in Lat. *secat*). See further Reichelt in KZ 39, 14 sq. Nobody doubts the correlation Ēɪ: Əī/ī, and Reichelt's lists justify Ĕɪ and even Ĕ as well. And now to take up our examples in more detail:

3. i. If Irish *srēdim* 'I throw' goes back to SPRĒI-DH- (so Brugmann, Gr. i, § 931), Welsh *cwyddo* (*wy*<Ĕɪ) legitimately derives from ĶĒI-D-, an extension of the root (s)K(H)Ēɪ/ (s)Ķ(H)Ēɪ [1] 'caedere'.[2]

4. ii. Just as OHG. *sceidan* comes from IE SKƏɪ-DH-, OHG. *meinen* comes from MƏɪ-N-, an *n*-extension of MĒ(ɪ),

---

[1] For a quick survey of the Protean varieties of this root the reader is referred to Boisacq, Dict. étym. de la langue grecque, s. v. σχάƺω.

[2] The absurdity of Walde's refusal to admit the correlation of Lat. *caedit*—identical with Av. *said* 'scindere', from (s)K̄(H)Əɪ-D- (see for the type AJPh. 37, 170, § 28)—with *scindit* will be revealed to any one who will read for its semantics Walde's own entry under ferio; and, for its phonetics, to the reader of his remarks on caelum and scio. Long ago, in AJPh. 26, 397; cf. ib. 174, I illustrated the semantic correlation between 'cuts' and 'falls' (caedit and cadit) by OIr. *do-ro-chair* 'cecidit': Skr. *çṛṇắti* 'crushes', pass. *çīryắte* (cf. the equivalent active *çīryati* 'decidit'); and by Lith. *krintù* 'cado': Skr. *kṛntắti* 'caedit'. Here add Lat. *cāsus* 'fall', which is certainly from IE KR̄TTUS; and Goth. *driusan* 'cadere': θραύεɩ 'çṛṇắti'.

in Av. MĀ(Y) 'metiri', cf. MĔ-D- in Lat. *meditor*: OIr. *midiur* 'iudico, aestimo, puto' (see Uhlenbeck, Got. Wbch. s. v. *mitan*). That ME-N, as well as ME-D, is an extension of MĒI need not be doubted. This question, however, is not important here, but only the synonymy of MEN with MĒI. Thus *meinan* belongs with IE Məɪ-NÉTI (type of Skr. *mṛṇáti*, cf. Brugmann, Gr. ii, 3, § 211 sq.; Goth. *skeinan*, OHG. *scīnan* have ī : əɪ, though ĔI is possible; see also AJPh. 37, 161, § 15 sq.), which meant 'measures, calculates, reckons, thinks'. Also note OBulg. *mě-niti*, which Berneker (Slav. Etym. Wbch. ii, p. 49) also derives from Məɪ-N-. As to its form, Skr. *mene* 'puto' is ultimately a pres. middle from Məɪ-NÉ-TI; cf. on the syntactical problem Speyer, Ved. u. Skr. Syntax, § 175.

5. iii. Skr. *tan* 'ten-dere' has a by-form *tāy*, and it is to the latter that ται-νία obviously belongs. Note the formal proportion Skr. *mene*: Av. *māy* 'metiri':: Skr. *tene*: *tāy*.

6. Certainly the Sanskrit perfects *çedus, mene, tene* contain a diphthong that admits of interpretation as proethnic əɪ, and it will appear in the sequel that this əɪ in the weak perfect stem (in middles and plural actives) probably alternated with ĒI (ĀI) in the strong stem. Our forms admit of being rubricated as *āˣi*- perfects: *āˣ*- presents.

7. From Greek also I will adduce three preterits in αι (αι) from roots with ĒI (ĀI), under conditions that admit of interpreting the αι αι as normal Greek shortenings of ĒI ĀI before consonants. The cases are:

8. i. Pres. δατέομαι (: DĀI 'dividere'): Cretan pf. δέδαισμαι. Because of the reduplication this instance is not necessarily typical of the IE alternation pres. ə : pf. *āi/əi*. Be it remembered, however, that the whole contention for a tense alternation *āˣ* : *āˣi* rests on the plea of allocation of etymologically justified *āˣ* and *āˣi* to tense function, that is to say, rests precisely on such groups as δατέομαι: δέδαισμαι.

9. ii. Ion. ἤ-νεικα/Aeol. ἤ-νῑκα: ἐ-νεγκεῖν (see Brugmann-Thumb, op. cit., p. 322).—*a*. The identity of ἤ-νεγκα with Skr. *ā-námça* (classified under *aç*, but certainly from *naç* 'adipisci') is one of the inexpugnable data of IE linguistics. The ἤ- is certainly the preverb ἔ (cf. ἐνείκεται in Hesiod) and, so far as the root may be written ENEK̂, its E- is like the ἐ of ἐθέλω. The primate of Skr. *ā-namça* was Ē-NE-NK̂E. I pass over, not

20

without admitting its bare semantic possibility, Brugmann's derivation of ἤνεικα from *ἐν-σεικα (cf. ἵκω/εἵκω 'venio'), quasi 'inveni'. The root to be sought, however, will have to be the root of νίκη 'victory', but in νίκη-φόρος (cf. νίκην φέρειν, a sort of figura etymologica) also 'prize'; cf. Skr. *bhára-s* 'gewinn, preis, beute': φέρει ("present" of ἤ-νεικα), and note the same figure in Lat. victoriam r e p o r t a r e. The root was NĒI-K̂/K, with grade forms Nᴈ IK/NĪK; and the difference between ἤ-νεικα and ἤ-νῑκα is to be interpreted as an alternation between a strong stem with ĒI and a weak with ᴈ I. The proof of a root NĒ(I)K is furnished by Lat. *nac-tus* with *a* from ᴈ: Ē. In Skr. *naç* we have a secondary *e*-grade root (*naç*: NĒIK̂:: Lat. *secat*: SĒIK). From a form with *k* (not *k̂*) we have Lithuanian *pranokti* 'adipisci'. As for Lat. *nanciscor*, it came from the interplay between reduplicated NE-NK- and Nᴈ K (Lat. *nac-*).—*b*. But ἤ-νεικα is ultimately a perfect of the root NĒ(I) 'ducere, to pull', in Skr. *nī*, among the meanings of which are 'hinführen, tragen, bringen zu' (Cappeller). A like development of meaning is attested by Eng. *draws* and *drags*: Germ. *trägt* (see e. g. Walde, s. v. traho). In middle forms Skr. *nī* is also defined by 'mit sich führen,.. n e h m e n[1] (als sieger <cf. νίκη>, eigenthümer, machthaber)'. Note the following renderings of -νεικ- forms by 'ducere, to pull'. In λ 265, ἀνένεικα = reduxi (Cerberum ad terram); Ξ 255 = Ο 28, ἀπένεικας = abduxisti (Herculem); E 885, ὑπήνεικαν . . πόδες = <me> subduxerunt pedes; π 326 = 360 ἀπένεικαν = 'they pulled <and then bore> off (the arms)'. In Latin *nī-t-or* 'I pull, strive', etc. (not to be confounded with *gnitor* 'I kneel') the root NĒI is also preserved; cf. Lith. *nì-k-ti* 'vehementer incipere'. In the preterit ἔ·νει-κα we may find the source of the k̂/k of the root *nek̂/*, cf. ἔ-δω-κα and Lat. *fē-ci*: *fac-io*.

10. iii. Attic-Ionic (ϝ)εῖπα 'dixi', Gortynian προ-ϝειπάτω. One can hardly doubt that the three Indo-Iranian roots represented in Skr. *vac* 'canere, vocare', *vad* 'dicere' and Av. *vap*[2]

---

[1] Goth. *niman* is from NEM, a by-root to NĒ(I); cf. Skr. *gam*: GĀ, Lat. *prem-it*: *ex-prē-tus* (see KZ. 43, 154); and the plural perfect stem is from *nē[i]-m-*.

[2] Because of Gāthic Av. *vafu-*, and pres. stem *ufya-*, Bartholomae writes the root as *vaf* (*f* from PH). But the *f* originated in Avestan from *-fv-* <*pv* in case-forms of *vafu* and from *-fy-* <*py* in *ufya-*.

'besingen', are parallel roots. Bartholomae in his lexicon rightly explains *vap* from the sense of 'weben', comparing Skr. *váyati* 'weaves, plaits' a song; cf. Γ 212, μύθους ὕφαινον "they began to weave the web of words" (Lang, Leaf, Myers). Skr. *vắc-* and *vácas-* keep the sense of 'song', and ἔπεα is Epic song. We find the root wēɪ-ᴅ- (: Skr. *vad*, IE wᴇᴅ) in ἀ-είδω ἀ-οιδός ἀ-ηδών, cf. ῥαψ-ῳδός 'stitching songs'> 'bard'. As a concluding argument that ϝεῖπα has a genuine *ĕi*-diphthong let Lat. *con-vīcium* 'wrangling, abuse, insult' serve. We find in Greek, with ἐν- (cf. ἐγ-γελᾶν, ἐν-υβρίζειν), ἐν-(ϝ)ιπή 'convicium': ἐν-ίπτω 'convicior, insector' (?: Lat. root *sec* 'dicere').

11. To sum up the results of the previous discussion: IE preterits with *i*-diphthong may be noted as follows:

(1) preterits in *ĕi* (type of Skr. *yete*, § 1): presents in *ĕ* (Skr. *yátati*), analogically extended perhaps to other than ʏᴇ-roots.

(2) a. preterits in *ēi*, type of ἤ-νεικα ϝεῖπα.
    b.   "   in *əi*, type of Skr. *tené sede* (§ 1).
    c.   "   in *ī*, type of ἤ-νῑκα.

All being preterits to roots in ēɪ, beside which stood parallel roots in ᴇ̆.[1]

(3) *ēi* preterits (type of ἔ-δειξα) : *ĕi* roots.

(4) *ē*[*i*] preterits: presents in *ĕ* (Goth. *nēm-um*: *niman*). I need not tediously point out to the reader that, by virtue of their common terms, shifts and shunts might be expected between all the members of these preterits : present groups. This observation will account for the phenomena that may be typified as the sᴛᴇɢ/sᴛᴇɪɢ alternations (on sᴛᴇɢ: sᴛᴇɪɢ see Lidén in IF. 18, 500).

12. We are now in a position to consider from a new angle of vision the VIIth Germanic Ablaut series, in so far as verb roots with ēɪ are involved. Here the phenomenon to be accounted for is that the second group of roots in ēɪ yielded in the present *ē*[1], written as Germanic (=OEng.) *æ*; but in

------

[1] We cannot tell whether *tene* came from ᴛᴇᴊɪɴᴀɪ or from ᴛᴇɪɴᴀɪ. Greek τείνω seems to me no less likely to have come from ᴛᴇ̆ɪɴō than from ᴛᴇɴʏō (on the *e*-vocalism see Brugmann, Gr. ii, 3. § 226 sq.; Arm. *dnem* from a stem ᴅʜᴇ̄-ɴᴏ-, ib. § 228). I know of no proof that aor. τεῖνε 'he pulled, drew, stretched' is from *ᴛᴇɴ-s-ᴇ, rather than from ᴛᴇɪɴᴇ.

the preterit $\bar{e}^2$ (West-Germanic $\bar{e}$). In the first group of this Ablaut series $\bar{e}^2$ preterits match presents in ∂I, i. e. prim. Germ. *ai* (OEng. $\bar{a}$). Here again we are dealing with ĒI roots, but the presents, instead of having the strong form in Ē[I], now have reduced vocalism. The root of pres. infin. *scādan*: pret. *ṣcēd* is SKHĒIDH 'to cut, separate' and *scādan* has the vocalism of Lat. *caedit* (§ 3, fn.). The root of pret. *hēt*: *hātan* ('to call') was KĒI-D-, cf. Lat. *cī-re*, κῑ-νεῖν, from the simpler root KĒI 'ire' (not KĀI as Bezzenberger has it in KZ. 47, 82), cf. Lat. *bu-cētum* 'cow-heath': Goth. *haiþi* 'field' (semantics as in Av. *čarāna-* 'field': Skr. *car* 'errare'; cf. Lat. *agri-cola* 'field-tiller'). Taking pret. *lēc*: *lācan*, Wright's remaining instance, the root LĒI-G- will satisfy all the phonetic conditions presented in the cognate words, cf. e. g. Boisacq s. v. ἐλελίζω.

13. Any phonetic solution of the conflict between $\bar{e}^1$ in OEng. *lætan* but $\bar{e}^2$ in pret. *lēt* must face the fact that IE ĒI is widely represented by Germ. $\bar{e}^2$ in nouns and other words of such large syllabic range that we are bound to admit that the mother speech delivered into primitive Germanic a relatively large number of words with ĒI, and that this ĒI, contrary to Brugmann's assumption (§ 1), remained intact ($>\bar{e}^2$) in open syllables everywhere, save in the present tense of verbs.[1] We may reconcile, then, the conflict typified by OEng. *lætan*: pret. *lēt* by saying:

 A. That the pre-Germanic alternation[2] pret. ĒI: pres. ĒI was analogically shifted to pret. ĒI: pres. Ē by influence of pret. ĔI:[3] pres. Ĕ in other forms (cf. § 11, 1 and 2).

14. Our first solution has been to find a diphthongal character for the IE preterit as compared with the present, and thereby to justify the Germanic presents in Ē[I] ($>\bar{e}^1$) beside the preterits in ĒI ($>\bar{e}^2$). But there is a second, and it may

---

[1] The surviving non-verbal ĒI forms are rarely, if ever, cognate with verbal ĒI forms.

[2] The term alternation first applies to the tense, only, not to the vocalism.

[3] It is to be very expressly noted that in the Germanic change from ĒI to $\bar{e}^2$ we are entitled to insert as intermediary a shortened *ĕi* which, to prevent confusion with IE EI, may be written Ĕ²I. Cf. the Celtic chain ĒI $>$ *ĕ²i* $>$ $\bar{e}$ in § 3.

be concurrent, way to account for the phonetic facts, and that is by saying:

B. That in pre-Germanic IE ĒI was reduced to $\bar{e}^1$ in verbs but (and possibly through ĕ²ɪ) to $\bar{e}^2$ in all other parts of speech, in so far as these were not reassociated with the $\bar{e}^1$ verbal forms.

And the rationale of this is simple. The Indo-European verb was, under certain conditions, toneless, so that our statement of the rule may be made in this form: (1) toneless IE ĒI yielded Germanic $\bar{e}^1$, (2) accented Ē²ɪ yielded $\bar{e}^2$. But this brings us again to the difficulty of pret. $\bar{e}^2$: pres. $\bar{e}^1$. It so happens, however, that the Indo-European preterits had strong and weak forms, so that in our root LĒID, e. g., we should expect strong forms in LĒID and weak in LǝɪD (cf. § 5; § 9 a), and this weak form is actually maintained in ONorse *leit*, OHG. *firleiz* (see Streitberg, op. cit., p. 333). But in the present, thematic LĒIDE- had no weak variant, though a weak present LǝɪDE- graded like Lat. *caedit*, might be admitted. The conclusiou of the whole matter results in the formula:

15. Toneless IE ĒI in verbs yielded Germanic $\bar{e}^1$, but in the preterit $\bar{e}^1$ was r e s t o r e d to ĒI (whence ĕ²ɪ>$\bar{e}^2$), partly by the influence of the weak stem in ǝɪ; or else m a i n t a i n e d by the influence of other diphthongal preterits (§ 11, 1 and 2), in which the diphthong had been fastened on as an earmark.

16. OEng. *mēd* 'meed, prize'. As a pendant to the discussion of the Germanic treatment of ĒI, a few words may be added on OEng. *mēd*. I write its primate as MĒI-DHĀ'. There was a metaplastic weak stem MǝɪDHO- in Skr. *medhá-sāti-s* 'prize-winning', cf. *medhayú-s* 'prize-seeking'.

17. In the compound MĒI-DHĀ MĒI is a root-noun meaning 'measure, exchange' (cf. Lat. *mē-tior*) used, like Lat. *de-mensum*[2], of the 'ration (or wage) of food measured out

---

[1] Perhaps the entire elusive proethnic fluctuation between Ē and ĒI may be referred to this principle. In that case ĒI forms in the IE verb will have been restored analogically from weak stems in ǝɪ, and also by reassociation with nouns and participles having ĒI (and conversely). There were also conditions under which the verb had tone, as in dependent clauses, and more especially in composition with prepositions, as in Celtic simple and double compounds, for instance.

[2] The *n* of *mensus* will have been brought over from an *n* present, say MĒ-NO-, like Arm. DHĒ-NO- (§ 11, fn.), blended with the *t* present

periodically to a slave'. The gods, like slaves and kings, also
had their measured portions (the tithe of Hercules, e. g.).
Other very interesting combinations are made between MĒI
'to measure out, allot; exchange' (='measure one thing
against another', cf. Lat. *mutuum, mutare*) and DHĒ; cf. Skr.
DHĀ 'geben, schenken', Lat. *facere* 'to sacrifice, offer, θέσις
'deposit, earnest money', ἀνάθημα 'offering'. In Av. *myaz-
da-*: Skr. *miyé-dha-* 'offering, sacrificial meal or gift' the
prius is IE MIY-ES-/MYES-, quasi 'demensum'. This prius is
further reduced to MĬS in Av. *mĭž-da-* 'stipulatum, merces,
wage': μισθός 'price'. In Skr. *mé-dha-/médhas-* 'sacrifice'
the prius is MƎI, or MEI. Note the posterius *-das-* 'gift' in
Skr. *mé-das-* 'offering <of fat>, whence 'fat'. From other
senses of MĒI comes the sense of Skr. *me-dhā'* 'sapientia';
cf. the *d* extensions in Lat. *meditor*, Greek μέδομαι, Goth.
mitan, OIr. *midiur* (§ 4).

18. As regards the flexion of IE MĒIDHĀ, (primate of
OEng. *mēd*), in the oblique cases, say the genitive, -Ā would
fall away before the case ending -ES/-OS, so that with proper
stem gradation we should have nom. MĒIDHĀ, gen. MƎIDHÉS,
and by backwards extension from gen. MƎIDH-ES a new nomi-
native MƎIDH-S. The point is worth making, as it enables us
to interpret Lat. *mercēd-* from *merces + d(h)-* (cf. Skr.
miyé-dha- above). This stem *merces-* may possibly be ad-
mitted for *Mercurius*. In Lat. *plē-bēs* we have in the poste-
rius IE -DHĒ alternating with DH in Gen. *plebis*. In *pu-bēs
puber-is* there is alternation of DHĒ and DHES.

EDWIN W. FAY.

UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS.

---

of *mētior*. Something similar has happened in the history of Lat.
mansus.

IV.—THE COMPOUND NEGATIVE PREFIX *an-a-*
IN GREEK AND INDIC.[1]

The compound negative prefix *an-a-* discussed in this paper appears in at least four Greek words: ἀνά-εδνος, ἀνά-ελπτος, ἀνά-γνωστος, ἀνά-πνευστος; in three Pāli words: *ana-bhāva, ană-mata, ana-matagga*; and times without number in the Prākrits and vernaculars of India. It also occurs in Avestan. It is composed of the two familiar negative prefixes *an-* (<I-G *ṇ̥-* antevocalic) and *a-* (<I-G *ṇ̥-* anteconsonantal), the two being welded together, as it were, into one indissoluble mass. There is abundant evidence to prove that in Greek and Pāli it is employed as a reinforced, emphatic negative prefix. On the other hand, in the Prākrits and vernaculars of India, the force of the prefix has clearly weakened and it is employed as a commonplace negative prefix in no respect differing from the simple prefix *an-* or *a-*, being pronounced, indeed, in most of the vernaculars like simple *an-*.

By an extraordinary coincidence of sound and use, the Greek prefix ἀν-a- and the Indic prefix *an-a-* develop apparently independently of each other from the same primitives, being sound for sound identical, being used in precisely the same way and with precisely the same force. The prefix is not Indo-Germanic, for it occurs neither in Latin nor in Sanskrit.

A dissyllabic *an-a-* does, indeed, occur in Sanskrit. Böhtlingk and Roth list the following words in which it occurs: *an-akasmāt*, 'not without a why or a wherefore', i. e., 'for a mighty good reason'. *an-akāmamāna*, 'not killing involuntarily', i. e., 'killing in cold blood'. *an-alasa*, 'not inactive',

[1] No systematic, comprehensive treatment of this prefix has ever been attempted. Brugmann has little to say about it in his Indogermanische Grammatik, and still less in his Griechische Grammatik. Meyer (Handbuch der griechischen Etymologie, i. 188) disposes of the problem by arbitrarily assuming the existence of earlier forms which there is not the slightest reason for believing ever to have existed. Boisacq ignores the problem entirely. For a well considered, although brief, treatment of the subject, see H. A. Hamilton, The Negative Compounds in Greek, Johns Hopkins dissertation, Baltimore, 1899.

i. e., 'lively as a cricket', 'busy as a bee'. *an-avadya*, 'not not-to-be-praised', i. e., 'beyond reproach'. *an-avāc*, 'not speechless', i. e., 'talkative', 'loquacious'. *an-aviprayukta*, 'not to be disjoined', 'inseparable'. *an-avrata*, 'not without austerities', i. e., 'austere of the austere'. *an-asūri*, 'not unwise', i. e., 'highly intelligent'.

But this dissyllabic *an-a-* is obviously an entirely different thing from the compound negative prefix *an-a-* described in the first paragraph. Take, for example, the compound *an-alasa*, 'not inactive'. The word is composed of the negative prefix *an-* + the substantive *alasa*. The substantive *alasa* is composed, to be sure, of the negative prefix *a-* + the root *las*. But no sooner is the compound *an-alasa* formed than the negative prefix *a-* of *alasa* ceases to be felt as a negative prefix at all. An agglutinate has been formed which means, not 'not inactive', but 'active in the highest degree', 'lively as a cricket', 'busy as a bee'. The negative prefix *a-* has altogether lost, so to speak, its negative character, its individuality, and the agglutinate *alasa* has no longer any negative aspect whatever. The word *an-alasa*, therefore, is no longer felt as composed of *an-* + *a-* + *-lasa*. In point of fact, and in the strict sense of terms, it no longer contains two negative prefixes, much less a compound negative prefix. It is composed of two elements only: the negative prefix *an-* + the substantive *alasa*. So with the rest of the words listed by Böhtlingk-Roth. They are unusually interesting specimens of litotes, but nothing more.

I. The Compound Negative Prefix *an-a-* in Greek.

(a) ἀνά-εδνος, 'with no wedding-gifts at all', Hom. Il. 9. 146, 288; 13. 366. (b) ἀνά-ελπτος, 'utterly unlooked for', Hes. Theog. 660. (c) ἀνά-γνωστος, 'an utter secret', Callim. fr. 422. (d) ἀνά-πνευστος, 'without a particle of breath', Hes. Theog. 797. Suidas (i. 361) mentions ἀνάπταιστον· τὸ μὴ πταῖον, 'inoffensum'.

(a) ἀνά-εδνος, 'with no wedding-gifts at all': Il. 9. 146: τάων ἥν κ' ἐθέλῃσι φίλην ἀνάεδνον ἀγέσθω, 'of these, whichever he desires, he may take as his own dear wife with never a thought of a wedding-gift'. Similarly, Il. 9. 288: τάων ἥν κ' ἐθέλῃσθα φίλην ἀνάεδνον ἄγεσθαι. Il. 13. 365 f.: ᾔτεε δὲ Πριάμοιο θυγατρῶν εἶδος ἀρίστην Κασσάνδρην ἀνάεδνον. 'And he asked for

one of Priam's daughters, for the fairest of form, Kassandra, never so much as mentioning the subject of a dowry.' Stephanus (Thesaurus Graecae Linguae, I. 2. 359) says: Itaque ἀνάεδνος dicitur ἡ πάμπαν ἄεδνος, Prorsus indotata: ut Eustathius [Il. p. 743, 5] ἀνάγνωστον dici ait τὸν λίαν ἄγνωστον, priore a significante ἐπίτασιν, altero autem στέρησιν. On Il. 13. 366, Stephanus remarks: Petebat sine dote sibi dari; tanto enim ejus flagrabat amore. Cf. Rzach, Wiener Studien, 19 (1897), p. 65.

(b) ἀνά-ελπτος, 'utterly unlooked for': Hes. Theog. 660: ἠλύθομεν, Κρόνου υἱὲ ἄναξ, ἀνάελπτα παθόντες. [The gods, released from their 'merciless bonds', address Zeus:] 'Here we are, son of Kronos, king, recipients of a boon utterly unlooked for'.

(c) ἀνά-γνωστος, 'an utter secret'[1]: Callimachus, fragment 422: μηδὲν ἐθέλω καλὸν ἔχειν ἀνάγνωστον, 'Nothing that is good, would I keep an utter secret'. This reading is attested by Eustathius (743. 7, 1684. 40). But see O. Schneider, Callimachea, vol. ii, pp. 596 ff. Cf. also Callimachi Hymni, Epigrammata, et Fragmenta, ed. Jo. Augustus Ernesti, Lugduni Batavorum, 1761, vol. i, pp. 570 f.

(d) ἀνά-πνευστος, 'without a particle of breath', Hes. Theog. 793-798:

> ὅς κεν τὴν ἐπίορκον ἀπολλείψας ἐπομόσσῃ
> ἀθανάτων, οἳ ἔχουσι κάρη νιφόεντος Ὀλύμπου,
> κ ε ῖ τ α ι ν ή υ τ μ ο ς τετελεσμένον εἰς ἐνιαυτόν·
> οὐδέ πότ' ἀμβροσίης καὶ νέκταρος ἔρχεται ἄσσον
> βρώσιος, ἀ λ λ ά τ ε κ ε ῖ τ α ι ἀ ν ά π ν ε υ σ τ ο ς καὶ ἄναυδος
> στρωτοῖς ἐν λεχέεσσι, κακὸν δέ ἑ κῶμα καλύπτει.

---

[1] There is an interesting occurrence of ἀνάγνωστος by haplology for ἀν-ανάγνωστος, 'illegible', in Dio Cassius, 40. 9. 3: εἰώθει δὲ καὶ ἄλλως, ὁπότε τι δι' ἀπορρήτων τινὶ ἐπέστελλε, τὸ τέταρτον ἀεὶ στοιχεῖον ἀντὶ τοῦ καθήκοντος ἀντεγγράφειν, ὅπως ἀνάγνωστα τοῖς πολλοῖς ᾖ τὰ γραφόμενα. 'Moreover on other occasions, whenever he had a secret message to send to anybody, he would always substitute for the proper letter the fourth letter beyond, so that the writing might be illegible to the casual reader.' Sophocles (Lexicon of Byzantine Greek, p. 137) acutely remarks: 'the context requires ἀν-ανάγνωστα, unless we read ἂν ἄγνωστα'. Bekker and Boissevain boldly emend ἀνάγνωστα to ἂν ἄγνωστα, although there is not the slightest necessity for it. E. Cary (Loeb Classical Library) follows both masters into the ditch and renders the emended passage: 'so that the writing might be unintelligible'. [This note is the result of a suggestion made to me by Professor G. L. Hendrickson of Yale.]

'Whoever of the gods ..... perjures himself, *lies breathless* for an entire year,—he never gets a taste of ambrosia and nectar—*not much!—instead, he lies without a particle of breath in his body ....*'. Evelyn-White (Loeb Classical Library) sees no difference in force between the prefixes of νήυτμος and ἀνάπνευστος, translating the former word 'breathless', and the latter 'spiritless'. For a radically different treatment of the word, see A. Thumb, Brugmann's Griechische Grammatik, 4th ed., p. 611, note.

2. THE FORMS OF THE NEGATIVE PREFIX IN INDO-GERMANIC.

Theoretically, at least, the Ablaut-forms of the dental nasal prefix which we should be most likely to find in Indo-Germanic may be set down as follows:

ne	no	n̥
nē	nō	n̥̄

I-G *n̥, Indic *a- an-*, Greek ἀ- ἀν-, Latin *in-*, Germanic *un-*, has been discussed in the first two paragraphs of this paper. The occurrences are, of course, innumerable.

I-G *ne, Indic *na*, Greek *νε-* in composition, Latin *ne-* in composition, occurs with a fair degree of frequency. It is represented in Greek by such words as νήκουστος, 'unheard', *νε + ἀκούω; νήγρετος, 'not to be awakened', *νε + ἐγείρω; νώνυμος, 'unnamed', *νε + ὄνομα. Formed by analogy of the above (Brugmann, I-G Gr. II. 1², p. 22) are νήποινος, 'without punishment', (ποινή); νηκερδής, 'without gain', (κέρδος).

I-G *nē is not represented in Greek. Its only representatives are Vedic *nā*, Lat. *nē*.

I-G *no and *nō are not represented.

I-G *n̥̄ is also not represented, in my opinion. Brugmann (I-G Gr. I. 1², p. 419) assumes the existence of I-G *n̥̄ to explain the prefix of νήποινος, νηκερδής. But later on (I-G Gr. II. 1², p. 22), he explains these forms (correctly, in my opinion) as due to the analogy of νήκουστος, νήγρετος, κτλ. Brugmann also (I-G Gr. I. 1², p. 419) assumes the existence of I-G *n̥̄ to explain what he considers to be the prefix ἀν- of ἀμφασίη (=ἀφασίη). The history of the prefix, according to Brugmann, is as follows: I-G *n̥̄- >*āν- >αν- (by vowel-

shortening bef. nas. + cons.). On the other hand Kretschmer (Kuhn's Zeitschrift, 31. 408; quoted by Boisacq, p. 57) considers ἀν- to be the anteconsonantal form corresponding to the antevocalic form ἀνα- in ἀνάεδνος κτλ. He is therefore led to postulate the following series of Ablaut-forms in Greek:

$$\text{ἀ- } (<\text{I-G *n-}): \text{ ἀν-}: \text{ ἀνα-}: \text{ νᾱ- } (<\text{I-G *n̄-}).$$

With regard to ἀμφασίη, it looks suspiciously like the snake ἀφασίη with the frog ἀμφί under its skin. With regard to ἀνάεδνος, if the explanation offered in the first two paragraphs of this paper be admitted, there is no necessity for assuming the existence of so extraordinary a series of Ablaut-forms as that postulated by Kretschmer. With regard to I-G *n̄, therefore, there is no evidence that it ever existed as a form of the negative prefix. In view of the foregoing considerations, I venture to express the opinion that the Indo-Germanic primitives of the negative prefixes in Greek are the following two, and only the following two: ne and n̩.

3. THE COMPOUND NEGATIVE PREFIX an-a- IN PĀLI.

(a) *ana-bhāva*, in the expressions *anabhāvaṁ gameti, anabhāva-kata (-gata),* meaning respectively: 'utterly annihilates', 'utterly annihilated'. For occurrences of the word, see Indices to the Aṅguttara and Saṁyutta Nikāyas. Cf. Vinaya Texts ii (SBE. 17), p. 113, note 4; also Andersen, Pāli Glossary, p. 8.

(b) *ana-mata, anā-mata,* 'Absolute Deathless', 'absolute immunity from death', epithet of Nibbāna. Jātaka, vol. ii, p. 56[1-14]. The commentator naïvely remarks that inasmuch as *amataṁ* is employed as a euphemism for *mataṭṭhānaṁ,* the author of the stanza employs *anāmataṁ* to bring out the negative idea. He adds that the reading *anamataṁ* also occurs. The commentator's explanation is of course purely fanciful. *anāmataṁ* is by metrical lengthening for *anamataṁ,* as a glance at the fourth pada shows: *n'atthi loke anāmataṁ.*

(c) *ana-matagga,* 'having no known or conceivable beginning', 'whose beginning cannot possibly be known or imagined', 'whose beginning is beyond the power of thought to conceive'. It is no exaggeration to say that this is the most

extraordinary and highly significant word in the Pāli language. An exhaustive treatment of this word will be furnished in a subsequent paper entitled Contributions to Pāli Lexicography, Part i.

4. The Compound Negative Prefix *an-a-* (*aṇ-a-*) in Prākrit.

As observed in the first paragraph of this paper, whereas in Greek and Pāli this prefix is invariably employed as a reinforced, emphatic negative prefix, in the Prākrits and vernaculars of India the force of the prefix has clearly weakened and it is employed as a commonplace negative prefix in no respect differing from the simple prefix *an-* or *a-*. By a familiar phonetic law, Sanskrit and Pāli *an-a-* becomes *aṇ-a-* in the Prākrits and vernaculars, being retained only in Urdū. In the vernaculars, except in Sindhī, *aṇ-a-* is pronounced like *aṇ-*.

[The words in the following list are taken for the most part from R. Pischel's paper in Bezzenberger's Beiträge, vol. iii, p. 243 ff., and from the same scholar's Grammatik der Prākrit-Sprachen, § 77, p. 69. The Old Western Rājasthānī words are taken from L. P. Tessitori's paper in the Indian Antiquary for January, 1916, p. 7. Abbreviations: G=Gujaratī, M=Mārathī, OWR=Old Western Rājasthānī, P=Pañjābī, Pkt=Prākrit, S=Sindhī, Skt=Sanskrit, U=Urdū.]

aṇa-īi, Skt. anīti, 'bad policy', 'imprudence'. (Pkt.) aṇa-uvasaṁkha, cf. Skt. upasaṁkhya, 'innumerable'. (Pkt.) aṇa-khaṁbho, 'without feathers'. (S.) aṇa-gaṇati, 'innumerable'. (S.) aṇa-gaṁtuṁ, 'not pleasing'. (G.) aṇa-gharī, 'houseless'. (OWR.) aṇa-ciṁtiya, Skt. acintita, Pāli acintiya, 'inconceivable'. (Pkt.) aṇa-cchiāraṁ, Skt. gloss acchinnaṁ, 'uncut', 'unbounded'. (Pkt.) aṇa-cchuṇṇa, 'untrodden'. (Pkt.) aṇa-jāṇ, 'not knowing'. (P. etc.) aṇa-jāṇaī, 'dost not know'. (OWR. Cf. Skt. a-pacasi and Greek ἀ-τίει, Brugmann, I-G Gr. II. 1², p. 106.) aṇa-dādhyo, 'without beard'. (S.) aṇa-teḍiu, 'not called'. (OWR.) aṇa-thiaṇo, 'impossible'. (S.) aṇa-dīdhu, 'not given'. (OWR.) aṇa-dīhara, Skt. adīrgha, 'not long'. (Pkt.) aṇa-dekhā, 'invisible'. (U.) aṇa-pariyā, aṇapadiā, 'unread'. (P.) aṇa-puccho, 'unasked'. (S.) aṇa-pharasataü, 'not touching'. (OWR.) aṇa-mānaṇem, 'despising'. (M.) aṇa-

mānu, 'contempt'. (M.) aṇa-milia, 'not having appeared'.
(Pkt.) aṇa-rasia, 'not short'. (Pkt.) aṇa-rahū, cf. Skt.
navavadhūḥ, 'not a newly wedded woman'. (Pkt.) aṇa-
rāmaa, Skt. *arāmaka (=Skt. arati), 'displeasure', 'dissatis-
faction'. (Pkt.) aṇa-rikko, Skt. gloss kshaṇarahitaḥ, nir-
avasaraḥ, 'inopportune'. (Pkt.) aṇa-lahivaü, 'impossible to
obtain'. (OWR.) aṇa-vayagga, Pāli aṇa-matagga, 'with no
known beginning'. (Pkt. See my Contributions to Pāli
Lexicography, Part 1, not yet published.) aṇa-var, 'not a
husband', i. e., 'a young fellow' (cf. var, 'husband'). (G. M.)
aṇa-vāṭo, 'pathless'. (S.) aṇa-vāṇī, 'barefoot'. (M.) aṇa-
vesāhī, 'unbelief'. (S.) aṇa-vesāho, 'unbelieving'. (S.)
ana-çruta, 'not heard'. (M.) ana-sikh, 'not taught'. (U.)
ana-sunā, 'not heard'. (U.) aṇa-happaṇayaṁ, Skt. gloss
anashtaṁ, 'not destroyed', 'not lost'. (Pkt.) aṇa-hiaa, cf.
Skt. -hṛdaya, 'unconscious'. (Pkt.) aṇa-honta, anahuṁta,
Skt. abhavant-, cf. Pāli anabhāva, 'not existing'. (Pkt.)
ana-hit, 'disadvantage'. (M.)

5. THE COMPOUND NEGATIVE PREFIX *an-a-* IN AVESTAN.

Bartholomae (Altiranisches Wörterbuch, col. 119 ff.) lists
the following words containing a compound negative prefix
an-a-: ana-marəždika-, 'pitiless'. ana-saxta-, 'not having
reached'. ana-ząθa-, 'unborn'. ana-šita-, 'uninhabitable'.
ana-xᵛarəθa-, 'without food'. ana-xᵛāsta-, 'uncooked'. What
is the precise force of this prefix, and what may be its
history, I am unable to say.

EUGENE WATSON BURLINGAME.

YALE UNIVERSITY.

V.—OMOROKA AND THALATTH.

The Babylonian priest Berossus says in the fragments of his Greek history of Babylonia (*c.* 250 B. C.) that the chief of the primeval monsters was a woman named Ὀμορωκα, which was in the Chaldean language Θαλατθ, and in Greek: θάλασσα. Then Bel came, cut the woman asunder, and out of one half of her he formed the earth, and of the other half the heavens. All this was an allegorical description of nature. For the Greek text see KAT³ 488.[1] Instead of Ὀμορωκα we must read Ὀμορκα, because Berossus adds that the numerical value of Ὀμορ[ω]κα was the same as that of σελήνη (κατὰ δὲ ἰσόψηφον σελήνη).[2] The numerical values of the letters of both Ὀμορκα and σελήνη are 301, whereas the numerical value of Ὀμορωκα would be 1101.

The alleged Chaldean (*i. e.* Assyro-Babylonian) word for *sea*, Θαλατθ, has evidently been assimilated to the Greek θά-

[1] AG² = Delitzsch, *Assyrische Grammatik* (1906).—AJSL = *American Journal of Semitic Languages.*—AkF = Zimmern, *Akkadische Fremd-wörter* (1915).—BA = *Beiträge zur Assyriologie.*—BT = Goldschmidt, *Der babylonische Talmud.*—CV = Haupt, *Die akkadische Sprache* (1883).—EB¹¹ = *Encyclopædia Britannica*, eleventh edition.—GK = Gesenius-Kautzsch, *Hebräische Grammatik.*—JAOS = *Journal of the American Oriental Society.*—JBL = *Journal of Biblical Literature.*—JHUC = *Johns Hopkins University Circulars.*—KAT³ = Schrader, *Die Keilinschriften und das Alte Testament* (1903).—OLZ = *Orientalistische Literaturzeitung.*—PSBA = *Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archæology.*—SBOT = Haupt, *The Sacred Books of the Old Testament in Hebrew.*—SFG = Haupt, *Die sumerischen Familiengesetze* (1879).—SG = Delitzsch, *Sumerische Grammatik* (1914).—SGl = Delitzsch, *Sumerisches Glossar* (1914).—ZA = *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie.*—ZAT = *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft.*—ZDMG = *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft.*—ZK = *Zeitschrift für Keilschriftforschung.*

[2] J. H. Wright (ZA 10, 74) thought that the original text of the phrase κατὰ δὲ [τὸ] ἰσόψηφον was perhaps κατὰ δὲ τοὺς Φρύγας, according to the Phrygians; but κατὰ δὲ τοὺς Φρύγας would never have been corrupted to κατὰ δὲ ἰσόψηφον. The emendation Ὀμορκα instead of Ὀμορωκα was suggested by Scaliger in 1606.

λασσα or θάλαττα. W. Robertson Smith suggested in 1891
(ZA 6, 339) that ΘΑΛΑΤΘ was a corruption of ΘΑΜΤϵ, *i. e.*
the Assyrian *tâmtu*, sea. In Damascius (*c.* 530 A. D.) the
name of the Babylonian sea-monster, which corresponds to the
Old Norse Midgardsorm, the monstrous serpent (*cf.* JBL 36,
95) which lies about the earth in the encircling sea, appears
as Tavθϵ (*cf.* KAT³ 490) with the second *t*, not the first, aspi-
rated. This is undoubtedly more correct, but even the second
t, which represents the Semitic feminine ending, would not
have been aspirated, unless it had been preceded by a vowel;
so Damascius' Tavθϵ should have a second *a* after the *v*. This
Tav[a]θϵ (not Tavθη, AJSL 34, 210, n. 3) is the Assyrian
tâmâti, seas, an intensive plural for the great sea, Heb. *jammîm*
(GK § 124, b. e). Assyr. *tâmâti* was pronounced *tâu̯âti* (ZA
2, 267; AG² 116). We need not suppose that Tav[a]θϵ repre-
sents Assyr. *tâmâtê* (see this JOURNAL, vol. 8, p. 276; *cf.*
Kings, SBOT, 270, n.*). We must remember that Greek ϵ
tended toward *i*.

Similarly we must read for ΘΑΛΑΤΘ in the received text of
Berossus, not ΘΑΜΤϵ, as suggested by W. Robertson Smith,
but ΤΑΥΑΘϵ, substituting Υ for Λ, and shifting the aspiration
as in Ionic κιθών for χιτών (AJSL 1, 231, n. 2). Smith's ΘΑΜΤϵ
could not represent the Assyrian singular *tâmtu*. This was
pronounced, with partial assimilation of the *t* to the preceding
m (SFG 43, 2; AG² 115) *tâmdu*, and the *m* became a *u̯*. In
some respect Lenormant's ΘΑΥΑΤΘ was superior to Smith's
ΘΑΜΤϵ.[1] Smith's chief merit in this case is his suggestion to
substitute an ϵ for the final Θ.

Also Tηθύς, the wife of Oceanus, which is supposed to be
connected with τήθη, grandmother, may represent this As-
syrian *tâmâti*, great sea, (*cf.* JHUC, No. 306, p. 34) just as
ἄβυσσος seems to be an adaptation of the Assyrian *apsû* =
Sumerian *abzu*, originally *zu-ab* (OLZ 16, 491). According
to Damascius, Aπασων was the husband of Tav[a]θϵ.[2] Assyr.
tâmâti was pronounced *tâu̯âti* or, with elision of the *u̯* and

---

[1] Lenormant, *Les origines de l'histoire*, vol. 1, p. 506 (Paris, 1880).
[2] *Tiâmat* represents salt water, and *Apsû* fresh water (including
underground water). The first tablet of the cuneiform Creation series
says that the waters of *Apsû* and *Tiâmat* mingled. *All the rivers run
into the sea* (Eccl. 1, 7).

subsequent contraction, *tâ'âṭi*, *tâṭi*, which would become in
Greek Τηθι, just as *Pârsa* appears as Πέρσαι = Πῆρσαι = Πᾶρσαι,
or *Xšaiâršâ* as Ξέρξης = Ξήρξης = Ξάρξας; see Haupt, *Purim*
(Baltimore, 1906), p. 23, l. 10. For the corruption of Oriental
names in Greek *cf.* Haupt, *Esther* (Chicago, 1908), pp. 11–14
and 68–70 (= AJSL 24, 107–110 and 164–166). Τηθύς, the
mother of the Oceanides, is, of course, different from Θέτις,
the chief of the Nereids and mother of Achilles, although
Latin poets use both *Tethys* and *Thetis* for *sea*. The υ in
Τηθύς may represent the termination *u* in *tâmâtu* instead of
tâmâti (see this JOURNAL, vol. 8, p. 267, below). We have υ
for Assyr. *u* in Μύλιττα = Assyr. *mullittu* = *mu'allidtu*, she who
assists women in childbirth; *cf.* Εἰλείθυια, *Lucina*, and JAOS
16, cvi; KAT[3] 423, 7.

As to *Omoroka*, Professor Jastrow suggested that this was
probably a corruption of *Marduk*, Merodach. Professor John
Henry Wright therefore proposed in 1895 (ZA 10, 71) instead
of ἄρχειν δὲ τούτων πάντων γυναῖκα ᾗ ὄνομα Ομορωκα εἶναι the
following reading: γυναῖκα ἣν Βῆλος ἔσχισεν (or ἔπαυσεν) ᾧ
ὄνομα ὁ Μορδόκα, but this is impossible. Greek and Roman
writers, as a rule, simply substitute their own corresponding
deities for the names of foreign gods. Herodotus *e. g.* calls
the gods of the ancient Egyptians Zeus, Hermes, Dionysus,
Pan, Heracles, Athene, etc. He speaks (1, 199) of the temple
of Aphrodite in Babylonia, although he states (1, 131) that
the Assyrians call Aphrodite *Mylitta*. For *Ea*, the protector
of the Babylonian Noah, Berossus substitutes Κρόνος. The
Romans called the chief god of the Teutonic pantheon Mer-
cury; therefore we have Wednesday (*i. e.* Woden's day) for
French Mercredi (Lat. *dies Mercurii*). The relative clause
ᾧ ὄνομα Μορδοκ might stand after an indefinite expression like
ἀνήρ, but not after a proper name like Βῆλος. We would ex-
pect Βῆλος ὁ καλούμενος Μαρδοκ (*cf.* 1 Macc. 2, 2) and not ὁ
Μορδόκα, with the article, as Wright proposed to read. In
Matt. 1, 16 we find Ἰησοῦς ὁ λεγόμενος Χριστός, although we
have in the following verse ἕως τοῦ Χριστοῦ; cf. also Matt. 2,
4; 16, 16, 20; Acts 5, 42, and E Preuschen's *Handwörterbuch*
(Giessen, 1910), cols. 656, below, and 1162.

I believe that Ομορ[ω]κα represents the Sumerian name of
Tiâmat, sea. It may be the Sumerian *um-engur*, mother of

the deep (*cf.* SGl 52, 35). Lenormant and Gunkel regarded the name as Semitic, explaining it as *Umm-Uruk*, mother of Erech, or *Umm-árqâ*, mother of the earth, respectively (KAT ² 492, 2). But *árqâ*, earth (Jer. 10, 11) is Aramaic, not Assyrian; the Assyrian word for *earth* is *erçitu*. Assyr. *Tiâmat*, sea (AkF 44) is derived from the stem *hûm*, to roar.

On the Græco-cuneiform tablets, which I discussed in my paper on Babylonian words in Greek, printed in the *Actes* of the last Oriental Congress held at Athens in 1912, Sumerian *u* is rendered by *o* and *ω*, *e. g.* δομ for Sumer. *dum*, child, and βωρ for *bûr*, vessel, which appears in Hebrew as *pûrâ*, vat (plural *pûrôṭ*) and *pûr* (plural *pûrîm*) urn (AJSL 24, 127; AkF. 33). Here we must remember again that Greek *o* tended toward *u*; the contraction of *o-o* is *ou*. We find *ω* for *û* also in νωρ σανη=Assyr. *nûr šamê*, light of heaven. In a gloss of Hesychius this word is miswritten σανη instead of σανη (CV 28). In other transliterations on the Græco-cuneiform tablets the *m* is preserved, but this may be merely historical spelling. We find *e. g.* for Sumer. *gišimmar*, palm: γισιμαρ, also the later (OLZ 17, 455; ZDMG 69, 565) form γισιγαρ. Sumer. *mun-bal*, he dug, is transliterated μονοβαλ; *dum*, child: δομ; Assyr. *miṭirtu*, watering: μιτερθ; Assyr. *emuq šamê*, depth of heaven: ημυκ σανη.

These tablets, which seem to have been written *c.* B. C. 100, also prove the correctness of my theories that at the end of a syllable voiced consonants became unvoiced in Sumerian as in German (JAOS 37, 322, n. 10) and postvocalic *b*, *g*, *d*; *p*, *k*, *t*, were sounded as the corresponding spirants, both in Sumerian and in Assyrian (CV 29, 7; ZK 2, 282, 1; ZA 2, 263; JHUC, No. 59, p. 117; contrast SG 17; AG ² 114): *e. g.* Sumer. *sig*, small (SGl 241, iv) is transliterated σεκ, and *šid*, trench (SGl 260): σειθ; the *ει* was, of course, pronounced *î* at that time, and *θ*, *φ*, *χ*, not as aspirates, but as spirants; therefore Assyr. *îku*, ditch, is transliterated ειχχ,[1] and *atappi*, canal :[2] αθαφε; *êpuš*, he made: ιφος; *Bêlit*, Beltis: Βελεθ; Sumer. *lipiš*, heart (SGl 171) :[3] λεφες.[4]

---

[1] This shows that the *k* is not a *q* (SGl 72; AkF 44) : *îku* stands for *ḥikịu*; cf. Arab. *ḥákka*, to engrave, scratch.

[2] Syr. *táppâ*; cf. Nöldeke, *Syr. Gr.* § 32.

[3] *Li-piš* means literally *šaman-libbi*; cf. *ḥel*[*b lib*]*bámo*, Ps. 17, 10.

[4] It is true, we find also *θαλ* = Assyr. *tâlu*, *φαλαγ* = *palgu*, ισφ . . . =

21

The χ must have resembled the German *ich-laut* (Sievers, *Phonetik*[5] § 341) rather than the *ach-laut*, because for the *ach-laut* (Scotch *ch*) a special sign is used: Ⴆ, and in the transliteration of Assyr. *ixrî*, he dug, this symbol is used for both *x* and *r*: ᏆჃჃᎬI.[1] In another line, however, it is written ᎬჃᏢᎬI with ρ. Brücke (BA 1, 257) believed that the Semitic *x* was a combination of the *ach-laut* and a uvular *r*; he therefore used the symbol [χᵃξ], ξ being Brücke's symbol for uvular *r*. In modern Greek χ has the *ich-laut* before *e, i,* and *y, e. g.* χήρα, widow, is pronounced *chîra*, as a German would pronounce the first two syllables of *Chiragra*, but χάρις, grace, *xáris*.

Some may be inclined to think that, if the χ had been the *ach-laut*, it would not have been necessary to invent a new sign, because the Phenician (contrast AJSL 27, 48) alphabet had a sign for the *ach-laut*; but this argument is not valid: at the time of the adoption of the Phenician alphabet the sound represented by χ was neither the *ich-laut* nor the *ach-laut*, but a real aspirate *kh* (BA 1, 259, n. 24). This was expressed by KH (*cf.* EB[11] 1, 726; 12, 499). Similarly we find in the cuneiform text of the Amarna tablets Assyrian *x* for Hebrew *h, e. g. xarri* for Heb. *har*, mountain; *xixbê* for Heb. *hähbî*,[2] he absconded=Assyr. *innibit*, he fled; *zuxru* for Heb. *çohr*, back=Assyr. *çêru*. Afterwards the sign for the Semitic *x* was used for η, just as *'Ain* was used for o; see this JOURNAL, vol. 8, p. 284; *cf.* Lagarde, *Mitteilungen*, vol. 2, p. 41.

We have this *ich-laut* also in French and in English. The *i* in French *pied, Pierre*, and the second *i* in *pitié* are really pronounced as the German *j* partially assimilated to the preceding *p* or *t*. We also hear it, according to Bell, in English word like *pure, pew, pewter*, or *hue, huge, human.* In *due*,

---

išpuk, φα = Sumer. *pa*, canal. The use in Old Babylonian texts of the sign *pi* for *ui* (*ua*) suggests that *p* was pronounced *f*; cf. ZA 2, 207; JAOS 37, 252; AG[2] § 24; Meissner, *Assyr. Gr.* § 8, c. See also ZAT 4, 63; 6, 220; contrast ZDMG 68, 267, n. 1.

[1] Photographic reproductions of these Græco-cuneiform fragments, with valuable comments by Pinches and Sayce, are published in PSBA 24, 108–125 (March 12, 1902).

[2] Cf. *naḥbêṭa libróḥ*, Gen. 31. 27. and the Talmudic *hähbî 'açmô bĕ-bêṭ hak-kissê*, Taan. 23[b] (BT 3, 494). See also GK § 53, e; *Kings* (SBOT) 174, 30.

duty, on the other hand, or French *vieux*, we have the corresponding voiced palatal spirant, *i. e.* the German *j* in *ja, Jahr*, etc. *Cf.* Viëtor, *Elemente der Phonetik*³ (1914), p. 117; *Kleine Phonetik* (1913), §81; Jespersen, *Elementarbuch der Phonetik* (1912), pp. 42, 102.

In his note published in ZA (1895) J. H. Wright stated that he would publish a detailed justification of his emendation of the passage of Berossus in this JOURNAL. So far as I know, this justification has never been published, and it was perhaps better that it was not printed.

PAUL HAUPT.

VI.—CICERO, AD ATT. XV, 9, 1.

When a few months after Caesar's death, Cicero heard that Antony intended to dispose of Brutus and Cassius by sending them upon a mission to buy grain, he expressed himself thus (Ad Att. XV, 9, 1): O rem miseram! primum ullam ab istis, dein, si aliquam, hanc *legatoriam* provinciam! Atque haud scio an melius sit quam ad Eurotam sedere, . . Ait autem eodem tempore decretum iri ut et iis et reliquis praetoriis provinciae decernantur. Hoc certe melius quam illa Περσικὴ porticus. *Nolo enim Lacedaemonem longinquo† quom Lanuvium existimavit†*. It seems that Cicero would have Brutus doing something worth while rather than wasting his time at his villa near Lanuvium—the stream and portico of which he had presumably called by Spartan names.

No satisfactory emendation for the end of this passage has been found, and though most editors have offered conjectures, none has dared to print his own proposal in the text. The one that has met with most favor perhaps is that of Gronovius: Nolo enim Lacedaemonem longinqu*iorem* Lanuv*io* exist*imaris*, 'when I speak of the Eurotas and the Persian porch I intend you to think of a Sparta no farther away than Lanuvium'. Cicero thus is supposed to be explaining to Atticus in cumbersome Latin his references to Eurotas and Persica, although Atticus was visiting Brutus at Lanuvium during these days even more than Cicero, and apparently knew the place very well (Ad Att. XIV, 21; XV, 4, 2; XV, 9, 2; XV, 20, 2). This obviously is not the solution. The clews to an emendation seem to me to be as follows: 1) Cicero really did not wish Brutus to go away since he wished him to stay near Rome to watch Antony (Ad Att. XV, 11, 1: neque nunc neque ex praetura—ires); 2) there is a word-play in the passage, for Cicero adds immediately: rides, inquies, in talibus rebus? 3) the word play probably begins with the expression *legatoriam provinciam*: *legatoriam* is so unusual that most editors question it, while *provinciam* does not again occur in the sub-

sequent references to this office. Cicero speaks of it as *curatio frumenti* in XV, 11, 1 and 2, also as *frumentum* in XV, 11, and as *frumentaria res* in XV, 12.

Now if we recall the passage of Euripides' Telephus—Σπάρτην ἔλαχες, κείνην κόσμει—to which Cicero has already alluded twice in his letters (Ad Att. I. 20, 3 and IV. 6, 2), and in which a man's " province ", that is, his one supreme duty, is called his " Sparta ", we may have the explanation of Cicero's play upon *provincia—Lacedaemonem* here. The sense is probably this: " I am not sure that this petty office is not better than sitting in his villa at Lanuvium, but I really do not wish him to go anywhere: I do not wish him to think his ' Sparta '—his real duty—elsewhere than right here." Perhaps Cicero would even imply that it was Brutus' " province " to strike down Antony (a few days later he said: quemquam praeterea oportuisse tangi, XV, 11, 2) as he had struck Caesar on the Ides. The Latin would be as near the reading of M as any emendation as yet offered: *Nolo enim Lacedaemonem longinquiorem Lanuvio eum existimare*, that is, he need not go away to find his one supreme task.[1]

TENNEY FRANK.

BRYN MAWR COLLEGE.

[1] It is tempting to seek a play upon several of the words of the original proverb since the transliteration of Greek words presents one of the chief causes of confusion in Cicero's letter. The original therefore may have been: Nolo enim eum Lacedaemonem λαχεῖν quom κοσμεῖ Lanuvium existimare—"I do not wish him to think that he has found his 'Sparta' when he is adorning his villa." This with its word-play on κοσμεῖ would perhaps justify *rides*.

VII.—LITHUANIAN *gaudonė* 'HORSE-FLY'.

Lith. *gaudonė* 'horse-fly, tabanid, Gastrophilus equi' has heretofore been connected with *gaudžù, gaũsti*, which Kurschat [1] translates: "'sausen', mit vorwaltendem *au*-Laut, z. B. 'weinen, jammern'; auch 'heulen' von den Hunden, Wölfen; von dem 'Summen' der Bienen, Mücken, doch nur wo es aus der Ferne als ein Massensummen gehört wird". Philologists, then, have regarded *gaudonė* as meaning etymologically "the buzzer, the hummer". Thus Leskien, Die Bildung der Nomina im Litauischen (Abhandlungen der philol.-hist. Kl. der Kgl. Sächs. Ges. d. Wiss., Bd. XII), p. 392: "*gaudonė* (Summerin) Pferdebremse: *gaudžù, gaũsti* summen". Similarly: Leskien, Der Ablaut der Wurzelsilben im Litauischen (Abhandlungen above, Bd. IX), p. 298; Berneker, Slavisches etymologisches Wörterbuch, s. v. *gǫdǫ*; Zubatý, BB. XVIII 262.

But the horse-fly does not buzz or hum; it is perfectly silent. On the other hand, its most obvious characteristic is that of striking, seizing, catching hold. I therefore propose *gaudonė* 'horse-fly': *gáudau, gáudyti* 'to seize, to catch', iterative to *gáunu, gáuti* 'to receive, obtain, take'. Cf. *árklį gáudyti* (Kurschat 116) "ein Pferd zu fangen bemüht sein"; *uzgáudyti* (Nesselmann 243) "etwas antreffen, darauf stossen, rauben, Beute machen"; *nũ bìtės uzgáutas* (Nesselmann 243; pret. pass. part. to *uzgáunu*) "von einer Biene gestochen".

Primary nouns of agency similar in formation to *gaudonė* are *valdónas* 'ruler': *valdaũ, valdýti* 'to rule'; *drykónė* 'a tall woman': *drykstù, drỹkti* 'to hang far down' (of a thread or a stalk of grain), etc. Cf. Leskien, Nomina, 392; Sommer, Die indogermanischen *iā*- und *io*-Stämme im Baltischen, 170, 180.

Notice further Nesselmann 245: "*Gaudóne* 'eine Premse, die den Pferden an das Ohr oder an die Oberlippe angelegt wird, um sie zu bändigen'". Certainly there is no buzzing

---

[1] Kurschat prints the word without brackets, thus indicating that it was thoroughly familiar to him.

LITHUANIAN *gaudonė* '*HORSE-FLY*'. 315

here, but quite as certainly there is a taking hold of a horse. There is no doubt that Nesselmann's word is identical with Kurschat's, but his definition is probably secondary. The transfer of meaning may have been due to semantic influence from the German—*Bremse, Pferdebremse* 'horse-fly': *Bremse* 'a twitch put on the mouths of horses to control them while they are being shod'. That the German word had made an impression, at least upon Prussian Lithuanian, is proved by Kurschat (Deutsch-lit. Wb., 259) : "Bremse, die, 'ein Werkzeug zum Drücken, Klemmen', *bremzas*".

If my derivation of the word should prove acceptable, *gaudonė* would desert the IE. group which has adopted it (Lith. *gaudžù*: Skr. *ghóṣa* 'noise, cry'; Goth. *gaunōn* 'to lament, wail'; OIcel. *gauta* 'to babble, chatter') and return to Lith. *gáunu*: Avest. *gūnaoiti* 'procures, provides'; Gk. γύαλον 'curvature, cavity, dale'; Lat. *vola* 'hollow of the hand'. Cf. *gaudžù* and *gáunu* in my forthcoming Lithuanian Etymological Index.

<div align="right">HAROLD H. BENDER.</div>

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY.

REVIEWS AND BOOK NOTICES.

Linguistic Change: an introduction to the historical study of language. By E. H. STURTEVANT, Assistant Professor of Classical Philology in Columbia University. The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, Illinois. 1917. Pp. ix + 185.

" This little book, which has grown out of lectures to students beginning their scientific study of language, is primarily intended as a textbook for similar introductory courses. It is hoped, however, that it will appeal to a wider public, and consequently technical terms and symbols that are not familiar to all educated people have been eliminated as far as possible." In these words, which begin the preface, Professor Sturtevant very aptly characterizes his volume. The separate chapters bear the headings: Introduction on the Nature of Language, Primary Change of Form, Secondary Change of Form, Change of Meaning, Change in Vocabulary, Change in Syntax, Language and Dialect, The Trend of Linguistic Development.

Now, with the book as a whole, the reviewer is in such thorough agreement that it seems to him hardly suitable here to use space in developing those views which Professor Sturtevant has set forth with clarity and force, and with examples drawn from his own experience and from that of others, not with the hackneyed illustrations familiar to the reader of philological treatises; but there are a few subsidiary points on which the reviewer feels doubt or holds divergent opinions, and to these he would devote himself.

On pages 6 and 8, we find the statement that in early times the Greek alphabet did not take account of the important difference between short and long vowels, and that even in its more developed form it did not distinguish them in all instances. As a matter of fact, the Greek alphabet paid no attention to matters of *quantity;* it was differences of *quality* only which it attempted to indicate. Incidentally, these differences of quality were in most instances combined with differences of quantity; and this has misled scholars into thinking that the Greeks took pains to distinguish short and long vowels by using different letters in writing—except for *a ι v.* The truth is that *a ι v* had the same quality whether long or short, and hence there was no call to differentiate them in writing; whereas long *e* and *o* were open, and short *e* and *o* were close, so that in the Ionic alphabet

η and ω, ε and ο were used respectively. But at the same time,
E represented both short ε and long ε—the latter being the so-
called spurious diphthong ει, arising from lengthened ε and
by contraction of εε. Similarly, O represented ο and spurious ου.
At Athens, matters were even worse: E represented ε, η, and
spurious ει; O stood for ο, ω, and spurious ου. When the Ionic
alphabet was introduced at Athens, E and O still had two
values, and EI and OY were not written for the spurious diph-
thongs until after these sounds had become identical with the
true diphthongs. The peculiar writings of the vowels in some
of the Cyclades, and those of " strict " Doric, furnish evidence
in the same direction; so does the confusion in spelling of post-
classical Greek. So far from finding variations of quantity
indicated by the use of different letters, the reviewer is not
aware of any Indo-European language which in its writing
differentiates longs and shorts of the same quality other than
by diacritical marks, or by doubling the letter, or by adding
a silent consonant.

On pages 11 and 137, and elsewhere, the mooted problem of
the speech-unit comes up, and decision is pronounced in favor
of the sentence in that capacity. Professor Sturtevant admits
that there are other speech-units, and regards the phrase and the
syllable as those of next importance after the sentence, while
the word as a unit is of very little consequence. This view,
while now much upheld, the reviewer regards as untenable (as
does also Prof. A. J. Carnoy in his forthcoming article, The
Predicating Sentence, TAPA. xlviii). The sentence, the
phrase, and the syllable are *phonetic* units, it is true, because
pauses may be made by the speaker at the close of any one of
them; but the word is the *speech*-unit, because the word is the
unit which is shifted from place to place, from phrase to phrase,
from sentence to sentence, ever taking its place in the sentence-
complex which is built up to express the thought. The phrase
is the complex unit, and the sentence is a phrase or a complex
of phrases. The whole matter is reducible to this: a child,
just beginning to speak, uses single words, not syllables, nor
phrases, nor sentences; phrases and sentences are later con-
structions, and syllables are obscurities whose separate entities
are revealed later by conscious study under instruction. These
first words are not necessarily monosyllabic like the " Damn! "
of the infantile hero of a recent work of fiction, but may even
be of five times that length, if family tradition be correct in
alleging that the reviewer's first articulate utterance was
" hippopotamus." But in developed speech, the phrase and the
sentence become phonetic units of great importance, as Pro-
fessor Sturtevant says; and yet they are always complex uni-
ties, since pauses may be made anywhere in them after a word,
or even after a syllable: witness the recent nerve-racking habit

of speakers in making a long pause for emphasis after the conjunction *but,* and the inter-syllabic pauses—" nine-ah-teen "—of a certain much beloved and lamented American Hellenist. And therefore the reviewer persists in maintaining that the word is *the* speech-unit.

As for differences of quantity of syllables (page 20), it is quite true that there may be an indefinite number of degrees of length; but no language will subject itself to an over-elaborate scheme, and syllables fall easily into a grouping of long and short, as the chief classification. Where a long is substituted for an unaccented short—as in Greek and Latin, in some meters, cited by Professor Sturtevant—it may be that we may draw a parallel from English verse, and support a stress-accent in the poetry of the classical languages: even in English we feel verse to be improved by the avoidance of heavy syllables in unaccented positions, but we do not proscribe their use.

And now for a series of short items. Page 22: even the avoidance of technical terminology hardly justifies the failure to use the term " vowel liquids and nasals," or the like, when the topic is to be discussed; in this instance, the lack of the term, or of a statement that *r l m n* may be vowels and not consonants, has made the subject much more difficult to the nontechnicist. Page 36: as a complement to the French spelling of *Schiller* with *G,* the reviewer has heard a German pronounce the French name *Sauvage* as though *Saufache;* German lacks the voiced French *g,* it is true, but has the voiced *v.* Page 38: in the hybrid *evoid* by contamination of *evade* and *avoid,* the *d* also is a factor, as well as the *v.* Page 45: we should expect the numeral *four* to appear in English and in German with initial *w-* (cf. Eng. *what,* Germ. *was,* Lat. *quod;* Latin *quattuor*), not with initial *h-,* as Professor Sturtevant states; *hw-* would be the initial in Anglo-Saxon and in Old High German, but not in the more recent stages of the languages. Page 49: it is regrettable that the Latin words have not the sign of length over the long vowels; particularly is this true when it seems to lead to the derivation of nominative *Pollux* from Πολυδεύκης, through the intermediate stages *Polduces* and *Polluces.* Now these forms do all occur, if we accept an Etruscan spelling, slightly different, as representing *Polduces.* But we should write *Poldūcēs Pollūcēs Pollūx;* and then the impossibility of syncopating a long vowel would make it clear that Latin *Pollūx* comes in reality from the vocative Πολύδευκες, with a short vowel in the ultima. Page 50: in *alacer elementum* etc., it might be well to explain that the assimilation of the vowel in the second syllable to that of the first is not a change, but a *prevention* of a change; assimilation may be either a change toward likeness, or, as here, prevention of a change toward unlikeness. Page 54: would * *socītās* for

sŏcŭtās for *societās* be a linguistic monstrosity, as Professor Sturtevant thinks? Even if one regard *fīnītis* from * *fīnietes* as a product of an analogy, there remains *tībīcen,* presumably from * *tībie-* from * *tībio-,* with analogical final stem-vowel. The reviewer considers *societās* and the like as new formations in this respect. As for *aliter* (page 115, n.), this cannot rest on * *ali-iter* with dissimilative loss, since the neuter of *alius* is *aliud,* and we should have *aliud iter,* not * *ali(um) iter* to work with. It can be derived analogically by means of the archaic nominative *alis,* thus: *fortis: forti-ter=alis: ali-ter.*

There are a few, a very few, lapses or misprints, such as *cordem* (page 69), despite the neuter gender of *cor; höid* instead of *höit* as the New York pronunciation of *hurt* (page 71); *θῦμα* for *θυμός* (page 73); Latin *mille* is not regularly an adjective in the singular (page 132), but in older Latin is regularly a substantive, and in classical and silver Latin is frequently so (TAPA. xlii. 74–77).

The introduction of *o* from the past participle into the preterit indicative in English verbs is, it is true, analogical (page 100); but verbs with the same vowel in the two forms, that cause the analogical change, themselves start with forms of the preterit plural containing the same vowel as the participle, and this factor deserves mention. Again, it is hardly fair to say (page 118–119) that the variation of vowels in English *drive* and *drove* "was not originally significant." However the *o* ablaut grades originated, the use of them came to be a definite factor in the formation of the Indo-European perfect indicative singular, and has this significance, unless the word "originally" is used by Professor Sturtevant as of a period antedating the perfect formation. In the phrase *Dis Manibus,* we are told (page 121), there is probably a trace of the adjectival use of *deus,* a use which otherwise is restricted in Latin to its phonetic twin *divus;* yet *dis* is in reality a form phonetically correct for both *deus* and *divus.*

"Etymology is a valuable study, but we should not expect it to help us very much in understanding our mother-tongue" (page 98). Is this true? Perhaps it might be for the speakers of a language which was, like the slave among the Romans, *nullis maioribus;* but when the earlier stages of the tongue in question are matters of record, as with English, French, German—to list no others—etymology is of great assistance. And when a speech is a hybrid, like English, etymology is of utmost importance in helping toward an accurate appreciation of the true meanings of the imported element. How often English writers and speakers use terms inappropriately for lack of knowledge of the basic significance: *lurid* as though meaning *brilliant, desiccated* as though *shredded, cupidity* as though *complicity!* The present-day signification must not, of course,

be crowded out of mind by that which the word had originally; yet many a time it is just the writer's feeling for the ancient values of words, surviving as a faint connotation in modern speech, that makes the difference between a slovenly style and a κτῆμα ἐς ἀεί.

Again, the reviewer can only in part agree with Professor Sturtevant when (pages 165–166) he disputes John Stuart Mill's laudation of Greek and Latin as superior languages because they have a regular and complicated structure. An analytical language, like English, expresses normally but one or at most two functions by one and the same word in any given sentence, and employs position to a great extent to convey syntactical relations; but a language which is inflective or synthetic may express several relations by one and the same form of a word, and may then employ position to convey the varying degrees of emphasis. How hard it is, by the printed page, to convey the exact shade of meaning of *Hanc habeo sententiam:* on the printed page the spoken emphasis disappears, and we must take refuge in italics or in grammatical paraphrases, or in a combination: "*This* is the opinion which I have." An inflective language has therefore certain elements of economy not shared by an analytical language. Latin, it is true, suffers from the want of articles and from a relative paucity of prepositions; but Greek suffers under neither of these disadvantages. Obviously no language has all the advantages and none of the defects; but there may be a greater profit to the speaker of an analytic tongue in the study of an inflective language, than in the reverse process (despite Sturtevant, page 166, ftn.), since the speaker of the former, in speaking, performs the analysis of his thought in an instinctive and sub-conscious manner, and is hence unable to employ the process of analysis consciously and at will. When he studies an inflective language, he must consider what various relations are conveyed in one and the same word, and must consciously deal with them in transferring those ideas from the foreign tongue into his own mother speech, or in making them his own intellectual possession. On the other hand, the speaker of an inflective language will find it easy to understand an analytic language, for in many instances a whole word complex falls into place in his own language in a single word, without any effort on his part. To take an example: the perfective and imperfective verbs of Russian offer no difficulty for translation from Russian into English, because English employs one and the same word to convey both ideas; but there is a very serious difficulty in translating into Russian. It is therefore more illuminating for a Russian to study English than for an Englishman to study Russian, since by this study the Russian becomes aware of the nature of discriminations which he must in every

sentence be making, and which he makes instinctively and unreflectively; but the Englishman merely rejoices that his own language is free from this quite unnecessary subtlety. Again, the Latin future expresses temporal future and the determined future; English distinguishes between them by a nice use of auxiliaries. The study of Latin is in this point a valuable aid in clarifying thought, since the distinction between the two kinds of futures must be made consciously in order to express the thought in English, or—not to confine the mental operation to translation, which is a means, and not a goal—for an English-speaking person to grasp the idea in its exact significance; but the Roman would find no such difficulty, and consequently no such stimulus to thought, in the appreciation of English *will* and *shall*.

But finally, in view of some differences of opinion, the reviewer recalls the words of Pliny the Younger, who, sending the Panegyric upon Trajan to his friend Voconius, urged him to criticize freely, "ita enim magis credam cetera tibi placere, si quaedam displicuisse cognovero." And it is in this spirit that the present review has been written. The book as a whole is so sane, so sensible, so scholarly, so lucid and so interesting even to the non-technical reader, that one can regret only that the publishers had not requested that its length be doubled, and the themes treated with less brevity and compactness.

ROLAND G. KENT.

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA.

Den Oldjavanske Wirātaparwa og dens Sanskrit-original. Bidrag til Mahābhārata-forskningen. Af K. Wulff. København, 1917.

The medieval literature of the island of Java is written in a peculiar artificial dialect called Kavi (tho it is not, as Weber supposed and as the name seems to suggest, exclusively poetic). A very large part of the vocabulary is plain and undisguised Sanskrit—unless the dropping of all inflectional endings be called a disguise. It is not, be it noted, in any way Prakritic. Along with the language, Indian literature, religion, mythology, art, and general culture were introduced to Java, where they soon strongly dominated the native elements.

The Kavi literature is now preserved almost exclusively on the neighboring island of Bali. Mohammedan zeal has nearly extinguisht it in Java.

Many versions of important works of Indian literature are known to exist in this Kavi language. For Indologists, doubtless the most important of them is a literal prose translation of the Mahābhārata, which must once have reproduced completely

and quite exactly a Sanskrit version thereof that was in existence in the tenth century A. D. (when several of the extant books of the Kavi version date themselves; the dates are precise and seemingly not open to suspicion). The oral learned tradition of Bali furnishes the names of all of the 18 books thereof—which names correspond in the main to those of the present-day Sanskrit Mbh. (tho with some puzzling divergences). According to this same oral tradition, all but eight of these books are lost. These eight are known in manuscript; but also, curiously, a manuscript has recently been discovered of one of the ten books alleged to be lost.

Five of these books—Adi, Virāṭa, Asramavāsika, Māusala, and Mahāprasthānika—have been edited at various times by the Dutch scholar Juynboll. The Dutch have, in fact, had a practical monopoly of work in Kavi literature. The fact that they have written almost exclusively in their own language has doubtless kept their valuable labors from attaining the prominence they deserve. Those who are ignorant of Dutch may, however, refer to JRAS. 1913, page 1 ff., where van Hinloopen Labberton has mercifully publisht in English some brief notes bearing on the present subject. Weber's article in Ind. Stud. 2, page 124 ff. (year 1853), is still the most elaborate study on Kavi now existing in an "international" language; it is for that reason still important, tho seriously antiquated and unreliable in various respects.

The book now under review is the first attempt at a thorogoing study of the relations between a book of the Javanese Mbh. and the Sanskrit versions thereof. The author modestly calls it merely a preliminary work and a collection of materials— not a complete collection, either, but rather an introduction thereto, with a selection of some especially interesting materials. A large part of the book comprises a detailed study of the Sanskrit verses or fragments of verses which are sprinkled thruout the entire text—each one generally followed by a paraphrase in Kavi. This is a most curious phenomenon, which is well illustrated by the passage quoted *in extenso* by van Hinloopen Labberton, l. c. It is demonstrable that the quotations were all, or practically all, taken directly from the original text, the source for the translation; but the motive of the selection of them has not been discovered. Wulff rightly finds unsatisfactory all the explanations that have been attempted. Nearly all the quotations are found (usually with more or less variants) in some of the Sanskrit versions now known, and Wulff carefully collates and evaluates the readings of the Calcutta edition, of the South Indian text publisht at Bombay in 1906, and of a Bengal version found in a Copenhagen MS., in comparison with the Javanese readings.

Besides this the present work contains general introductory material, a discussion of the divisions of the work in the several known versions, and a detailed study of selected passages of particular interest. The author promises later to publish the materials for a systematic comparative study of the entire Virāṭaparva.

Wulff believes, and shows good grounds for believing, that from the Javanese Mbh., as far as it is preserved, can be got a pretty good and accurate picture of its original—that is, of a Sanskrit version that existed in the 10th century A. D. If this is true, as it seems to be, then the importance of the work is evident. Hardly any Indian MSS. of the Mbh. are over 200 years old; and no Sanskrit version, in its present form, can be guaranteed any such antiquity as 1000 A. D.

Wulff's aim is, then, to submit the materials for judging of the probable aspect of that tenth-century Mbh., as compared with known Sanskrit versions. His results, as he emphasizes, are only tentative, and are only partly available in the present volume. And in so far as his conclusions can be summarized at all as yet, they are mostly hard to state in a few words. He thinks it likely that the original of the Javanese stood rather by itself genetically—that is, it was related to both the Northern and Southern Sanskrit texts (so far as known to him) less closely than are those texts related to each other. Superficially, it resembles the Northern text much more than the Southern; but there is reason to believe that this is due to late and secondary changes in the latter; and some important evidence points to a rather closer connexion with the Southern text than with the Northern. The Harivaṅśa apparently was not attacht to the Sanskrit version that came to Java in the tenth century A. D. (page 27), which is interesting in view of Bühler's well-known thesis that the Mbh. must have been complete in substantially its present proportions, including the Harivaṅśa, in 532/3 A. D.

The reviewer is imprest, on the one hand, with the thoro and painstaking way in which Wulff has obviously done his work, and, on the other hand, with the caution and conservatism which temper his lucid and skillful presentation. Caution and conservatism are only too frequently missing in such comparative studies of versions of a work. Wulff's work is no mere tabulation, tho his modesty sometimes suggests that. It is not lacking in keen insight. It is strikingly lacking in bold generalizations and cocksure pronouncements. The few generalizations which are made, like those quoted above, are set forth with cautious qualifications, and after most careful presentation of evidence pro and con.

These characteristics and the importance of the subject make the book one that can be heartily commended to all who are

interested in the history of the Mbh. (N. B. not its pre-history or genesis; except as to the Harivaṅśa, it presents no reason to question Bühler's above-mentioned thesis). I trust that fear of the Danish language (the learning of which is an amazingly slight task for anyone well acquainted with German and English) will not deter any such persons from making its acquaintance. Yet it does, after all, seem a curious fatality that a second "minor" language (no offense intended) should be added to Dutch as a necessary equipment for those who would familiarize themselves with this field!

<div align="right">Franklin Edgerton.</div>

University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.

L. Clédat, Manuel de Phonétique et de Morphologie Historique du Français. Paris, Hachette, 1917. Pp. vi+282.

The well-known professor of the University of Lyons, M. Léon Clédat, has set forth in this brief compendium of French historical grammar the standard views of the subject. He has modified them here and there in accordance with his own views, familiar to scholars from articles in his Revue de philologie française et de littérature.

The most original feature of the book is the extended discussion of the treatment of final consonants in modern French, whether in *liaison* or not. Here we find a number of new suggestions, and, as in all the works of M. Clédat, many valuable remarks upon current usage. We learn, for instance (p. 157), that the *s* of *os* in the plural, which tends more and more to be pronounced, is still uniformly mute in familiar phrases such as ' il ne fera pas de vieux ô,' ' être trempé jusqu'aux ô.' As the writings just cited may be taken to indicate, there are abundant evidences that M. Clédat is a spelling reformer.

Another novel trait of the work appears in certain departures from usual practice in the organization of the phonology, such as taking up atonic vowels before others. The general plan of this part of the work, however, does not differ markedly from that of Nyrop's Grammaire historique de la langue française. This section of the book suffers from somewhat excessive condensation. As a result, an elementary student would be likely to find some of the statements made obscure and even misleading. Thus on p. 57 we have *quinquanta* as the radical of *cinquante,* while on p. 88 the author gives the correct explanation that the French word comes from a dissimilated form in *cinq*—. Again, we are told on p. 16 that the accented vowel of a Latin monosyllable is always treated as though it were free,

i. e., in an open syllable. It is not until we reach p. 37 and p. 133, respectively, that we learn that M. Clédat considers—rather questionably—that *jam* and (*il*) *lac* were proclitics and hence treated otherwise. On p. 61 it is stated that a following nasal vowel prevents free tonic *o* from changing to *eu,* and *bone*<*bona* is cited as an example. Nothing whatever is said of the existence of *buene* in Old French!

Aside from these defects due to brevity of statement, occasional explanations are given which need revision. Thus the comparison of other Romance languages makes it fairly certain that French *huis* comes from * *ūstium,* not from * *ŏstium.* It is improbable that the feminine plurals *les* and *mes,* instead of * *las* and * *mas,* are to be accounted for by the analogical influence of *cez, ces* (p. 20). * *Las* and * *mas* are found nowhere in French, while M. Clédat himself notes (pp. 7–8), that *cez, ces* are derived " ultérieurement " from *cestes,* a form which exists. Again, Orelli's and Scheler's etymon *sub longum* for *selonc* should not be mentioned (p. 135) to the exclusion of *secundum,* the much more probable base. The name *ye* for " *i* grec " or rather " yod " is a somewhat unfortunate neologism, especially as it is used as early as p. 9 and is not explained until we reach p. 71, n. 1! Our students have enough real difficulties to struggle with; let us spare them unnecessary innovations in terminology!

The morphology is planned on broader lines than the phonology. It contains fewer details, and is consequently more readable. Here again there are a number of interesting examples from modern popular usage, such as *elle se décolte* (=*décollète*) [p. 219, n.; cf. Martinon, Comment on prononce le français, p. 174, n.] and *viendre* (=*venir*) [p. 207].

Despite the defects we have noted, M. Clédat's book will be of service for the pedagogical purposes for which it was intended. Scholars who read it will also glean valuable bits of information from its unpretentious pages.

D. S. BLONDHEIM.

JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY.

REPORTS.

Die römische Poesie in der sullanischen Zeit (161–195). Fr. Leo intended this account of Roman poetry to serve as the first chapter of the second volume of his history of Roman literature. It is the only one of his unpublished writings found to be nearly complete. Beginning with a brief characterization of the period, he gives an account of Sulla and his literary work, particularly the egotistic memoirs. Thereupon he takes up the decadence of the dramatic literature, and gives a condensed, but illuminating account of the literary Atellana, of which Pomponius and Novius were the chief exponents. Then we learn of Laevius and his poems in manifold meters, who calls his critics 'subductisupercilicarptores'; of Sueius' Moretum, etc. (cf. Rh. M. XXXVII, p. 342), and of Gnaeus Matius' Mimiambi. The chapter closes with Cicero's metrical compositions, especially his translation of Aratus' Phaenomena. The fascicle opens with an obituary notice of Leo.

Hortensius und Cicero bei historischen Studien (196–213). F. Münzer publishes this study of the Annales of Q. Hortensius, in advance of a delayed, larger investigation, in order to redeem his pledge to F. Vonder Mühll (cf. Pauly-Wis. R. E. VIII 2481, 8). In consequence of the agreement between Lucullus, Hortensius and Sisenna (cf. Plut. Luc. 1, 5; Wölfflin, A. J. P. XV 393), the writing of a poem on the Social war fell to the lot of Hortensius (cf. Schanz, Gesch. d. röm. Lit. 1, 2³, 210). Considering the circumstances and other scanty evidence M. concludes that it had no historical value, although on account of personal mention it was preserved in the family archives of the noted Magii (cf. Livy XXIII, 7, 4–10, 13; Sil. It. XI 157–258, 377–384); where it was seen by Velleius, a member of the family. Catullus 95 has a fling at this youthful performance of Hortensius. The citations of Hortensius as an historical authority by Cicero, are merely references to verbal communications.

Zur Textkritik der Dionysiaka des Nonnus (214–228). H. Tiedke shows that the MS tradition of the Dionysiaca should be retained in a number of passages that modern scholars have tried to emend; e. g. A. Ludwig in his edition (Leipzig, 1909 and 1911). The style of Nonnus is interestingly illustrated in a number of citations.

Porsons Gesetz (229–245). K. Witte discusses with approval the observations made by J. Král in his article entitled, Porsons Gesetz, Ein Beitrag zur Lehre vom griech. Trimeter, which appeared in the Sitzungsb. d. böhmischen Gesellschaft d. Wiss., hist. Klasse, 1909, IX. According to this law a tragic trimeter, ending in a cretic word that is preceded by a word of more than one syllable, must have a 'rational' fifth foot, i. e. iamb or tribrach; hence Eur. Ion 1, Ἄτλας ὁ χαλκέοισι νώτοις οὐρανόν, is faulty. Král endeavors to eliminate the law; but Witte, on the contrary, using K's statistics, thinks the law formulates the aim of the tragic poets to avoid a pause before the cretic word, which would be felt, if the fifth arsis (not a monosyllable) is long; because such a pause would obscure the regular penthemimeral or hephthemimeral caesura. Numerous observations are made, including the similar treatment by the tragic poets of the trochaic tetrameter, and of the hexameter by the Alexandrine poets. A broad treatment of these phenomena is necessary.

Auguria salutis (246–252). F. Blumenthal discusses this ceremony which, hitherto known from Dio XXXVII 24, 1, Tac. XII, 23, Cic. de leg. II 21, etc., has now become clearer from an inscription recording these auguria for the years 1, 2, 3, 8, 12 and 17 (cf. Not. d. Scavi 1910, pp. 132 ff., and Comptes rend. de l'acad. des insc. 1911, pp. 49 ff., etc.). The inscription records maxima auguria for the years 3 and 17, and also that on the latter date an ordinary augurium was taken as well. B. reviews the military history of Rome to show why, in certain years, the ordinary augurium salutis was omitted, and why the auguria mentioned for the years 63, 29 B. C. and 24 A. D. may be regarded to have been maxima, and the only other one known (49 A. D.) was an ordinary ceremony. He connects the augurium for the year 63 B. C. with the capture of Jerusalem. If the augurium was affirmative then followed the petitio salutis, which was undertaken by magistrates, or priests other than augurs.

Nochmals Aedilis lustralis und die Sacra von Tusculum (253–272). A. Rosenberg maintains against Leuze (above), that the aedilis lustralis in Tusculum, must be distinguished from the political aidiles; hence should be recognized as one of the priestly dignitaries. There are indeed a few examples of lustralis in the sense of five-yearly; but nowhere is a quinquennial magistrate called lustralis, although they existed in hundreds of cities. Lustration of the community was indeed a magisterial function in Rome (Leuze); but this was not so all over Italy; e. g. in Iguvium a college of priests had charge of it; besides in Rome special lustrations were in the hands of the Arval brethren and the Luperci, and to this class

we may assign the Tusculan aidilis lustralis. That the Lau-
rentes Lavinates, the sacerdotes Lanuvini and Tusculani were
titles conferred by the Roman state (cf. Mommsen, Staatsr.
III 579 f.) is disproved by Livy VIII 14, 2. R. discusses at
length these priesthoods, as well as the sodales iuvenum in
Tusculum, composed of maidens.

Der zweite Triumvirat (273–295). W. Kolbe argues in-
terestingly that Octavian still held the triumviral power rei
publicae constituendae, when the break with Antony came
32 B. C.; hence he was chosen defender of the state while in
the capacity of triumvir; consequently in virtue of the coniu-
ratio of all Italy he legally retained the functions of the
triumvirate until he resigned them to the senate and people
27 B. C. While agreeing with Mommsen (Staatsr. II³ 720,
745) in these essentials, he meets the objections of Kromayer,
who holds that Octavian obtained the supreme command of
the army 32 B. C. by a coup d'état, as the second five-year
term of the triumvirate, agreed upon by Octavian and Antony
at Tarentum 37 B. C., had expired at the close of 33 B. C. But
Kolbe, basing his argument mainly on Appian's Illyrice 28,
which was derived from the autobiography of Augustus, a
more reliable source than the Monum. Ancyranum c. 7, and
the Fasti consulares I, I, 37, shows that the second five-year
term continued through the year 32 B. C.

Per l'interpretazione del testo etrusco di Agram (296–304).
E. Lattes continues his discussion of these inscriptions (cf.
A. J. P. XXXVIII, p. 450), with the conviction of Bücheler,
that a close relationship existed between the Etruscan and
Latin languages. A genitive is indicated by 's, and words
ending in m or n may be objects of verbs. The words: fasei
śpureśtreś enaś eθrse tinśi(m) tiurim avilś χiś, announce the
celebration of funeral rites at the time of the new moon in the
year χiś (forse 'quinto' ossia 'lustrale') and month Tinśi
('Giovio'). Closely connected with this follows a frequent
formula: cisum pute, in which 'pute' means something like
'potavit, libavit'. In spite of the enormous difficulties due to
various readings, lacunae, order of words, obscure and un-
known readings, the results are certi o probabili o possibili.

Zur ersten Rede des Antiphon (305–310). H. Mutsch-
mann objects to Thalheim's transpositions in this speech (see
above). The present order is characteristic of Antiphon's
sophistic style of argumentation. The second πῶς sentence
(§ 7) is genuine and the traditional order correct.

Miscellen: F. Vollmer (311–314) publishes a few funer-
ary inscriptions from Trent, Austria, collected by Aventinus
in the XVI century.—A. Rehm (314–315) publishes his re-
vision of inscription Miletus III, n. 164, following the sug-

gestions of v. Wilamowitz (Gött. gel. Anz. 1914, 108).—C. Robert (315–319) discusses the fragment of Pindar's VIII paean (Oxyrh. Pap. V 841, p. 65), which shows that Hecabe's dream, presaging the destruction of Troy, was not an invention of Sophocles (cf. Bild u. Lied 233 ff.); but whether Pindar knew the myth of the exposure of Paris is uncertain, hence the conjecture, v. 35 ... ἔσφα]λε is doubtful. For Ἐρι[νύν (v. 30), read ἐρι[σφάραγον (or a similar adjective).—A. von Blumenthal (319–320) finds the Hesiod fragm. 219 (245 Rz.): Νήπιος ὃς τὰ ἕτοιμα λιπὼν ἀνέτοιμα διώκει, paraphrased in Pindar P. III 21 f., who took the myth from the Ἠοῖαι of Hesiod (cf. Gildersleeve's Pindar, l. c., v. 8); hence the above fragment can now be properly assigned.—P. Stengel (320) corrects his emendation of Plut. Cim. 18 ἀπέτεμε> ἐνέτεμε to ἀνέτεμε, as this form occurs in the very similar passage of Polyaen. Strateg. IV 20 (cf. A. J. P. XXXVIII, p. 452). —C. Robert (320) substitutes Paul Hermann for Treu in Hermes XLIX, p. 18, and p. 19 n. 1; and p. 159 Weege should be credited for suggesting Aphrodite, not Nike.

HERMAN LOUIS EBELING.

GOUCHER COLLEGE.

REVUE DE PHILOLOGIE, Vol. XLI (1917).

Pp. 5–99. La langue des tablettes d'exécration latines: Phonétique (consonantisme), Morphologie, Formation des mots, Vocabulaire, by Maurice Jeanneret. Intervocalic *g* is often written *c*; *qu* sometimes becomes *c* in the word *quomodo*; *d* is confused with *r* under the influence of Italic dialects; initial *b* and intervocalic *b* are confused with *v*; the semi-vowels *i* and *v* are sometimes absorbed; *v* followed by *u* is dropped; *h* is often omitted. Final *t* is sometimes dropped in the 3 pers. sing. of verbs; final *d* often becomes *t*; final *s* is regularly retained; final *m* is very often omitted. Certain vulgarisms appear in the declensions of nouns, and there is some confusion of genders—between masculines in -*us* and neuters in -*um*, between neuter plurals and feminine singulars in -*a*. Some deponents have become active; a deponent perfect has the auxiliary in the perfect (*locutus fuerit*). The tablets furnish 16 new words, and 21 rare words; foreign words are very rarely used. They give, further, such expressions as *minus facere, contravenire* ('engager une polémique contre quelqu'un'), *suprascribere*, the conjunction *sic quomodo*, and the preposition *desub*.

Pp. 100–109. Notes sur les recensions hésychienne et hexaplaire du livre d'Esdras-Néhémie (Ἔσδρας β'), by Gustave Bardy.

Pp. 110–112. Bulletin Bibliographique. Review of J. B. Edwards, The Demesman in Attic Life, Baltimore, 1916 (Bernard Haussoullier).

Pp. 113–125. Passages controversés des Dionysiaques de Nonnos, by Paul Collart. Textual notes on II 143, XII 21, XIV 128, XXVI 235, XXXVIII 212, XLVII 649–650.

Pp. 126–153. La langue des tablettes d'exécration latines (suite) : Syntaxe, Conclusions, by Maurice Jeanneret. The 'conclusions', pp. 149–153, indicate the importance of this long article to the student of vulgar Latin. An index is added on pp. 249–257.

Pp. 154–168. Bulletin bibliographique. Reviews, among others, of C. Sallusti Crispi Bellum Iugurthinum, Rec. Axel W. Ahlberg, Gotoburgi, 1915 ('une excellente édition critique', Paul Lejay); Mrs. Arthur Strong, Apotheosis and After Life, London, 1915 (Paul Lejay); John E. B. Mayor Alex. Souter, Q. Septimi Florentis Tertulliani Apologeticus, Cambridge, 1917 (Paul Lejay).

Revue des revues (1916).

Pp. 169–184. L'exil de Juvénal et l'Ombos de la xvᵉ satire, by P.-Hippolyte Boussac. The place of Juvenal's exile was the Great Oasis (now called El-Khargeh) at the southern extremity of Egypt. The site of Ombos was determined by the excavations of Flinders Petrie and Quibell, in 1895; it is north of Nagada on the border of the desert, about four kilometers from the modern village of Ballas. In the battle of the Fifteenth Satire, the Tentyrites seem to have been the aggressors.

Pp. 185–217. Essais et notes sur Virgile, by Paul Lejay. XI. L'ombilic de l'Italie. Note on Aen. VII 563, 'locus Italiae medio', where Servius has, 'Hunc locum umbilicum Italiae chorographi dicunt'. XII. Le sanctuaire des Paliques. Note on Aen. IX 585, with a study of Macrobius, V 19, 25. Macrobius' quotation from Callias should perhaps be corrected to read ὑφ' ᾗ καὶ τοὺς Δελφοὺς καλουμένους εἶναι συμβέβηκεν. Οὗτοι δὲ κρατῆρες δύο εἰσίν, οὓς (sic!) δελφύας τῶν Παλικῶν οἱ Σικελιῶται νομίζουσιν. XIII. Les cinq éléments. Note on Aen. X. 100–102. Virgil distinguishes five elements; the air and the ether count as two. XIV. La neutralité des dieux. Note on Aen. X 104–112. XV. Quin. Note on the expression 'non hoc negares quin', Aen. X 614. 'Quin' may be translated by 'but'. XVI. Doubles comparaisons similaires (Aen. VII 698–

705; X 132–138; X 270–276; I 315–317). XVII. Appari-
tions divines et effets de lune. XVIII. L'idée de la voix
moyenne. M. Lejay finds four verbs in Virgil compounded
with *ad* which have a middle meaning, *adparo, adservo, ad-
simulo, advelo.* XIX. Regnatus, triumphatus. Remarks on
the use of the passive of intransitive verbs.

Pp. 218–220. Bulletin bibliographique. Review of J. W.
White, The Scholia on the Aves of Aristophanes, Boston,
1914 (Georges Méautis).

Revue des revues (1916).

Pp. 221–230. Notes critiques sur la version latine du Περὶ
ἀέρων, ὑδάτων, τόπων, by Max Niedermann.

Pp. 231–233. Sur un prétendu fragment de Lucilius, by
Max Niedermann. In C. G. L. V 234, 1, 'pistris belua maris
lucius "pistrices" dixit pluraliter', G. Loewe changed 'lucius'
to 'Lucilius'. But the gloss is probably corrupt, and 'lucius'
is merely the name of a fish.

Pp. 234–242. Remarques sur quelques passages du discours
de Démosthène contre Leptine, by R. Cahen. Notes on §§ 15
(defense of the word τιμᾶν), 47, 55, 91–92, 95–97, 101, 115,
118, 130.

Pp. 243–248. Bulletin Bibliographique. Reviews, among
others, of R. Cagnat et V. Chapot, Manuel d'archéologie
romaine, Tome I, Paris, 1917 (Bernard Haussoullier) ; R.
Kühner, Ausführliche Grammatik der lateinischen Sprache;
Zweiter Band, Satzlehre, Zweiter Teil; neubearbeitet von Carl
Stegmann, Hannover, 1914 (Paul Lejay) ; A. Gudeman, P.
Cornelii Taciti Dialogus de Oratoribus, Leipzig, 1914 (Paul
Lejay).

Pp. 249–257. La langue des tablettes d'exécration latines;
Index, by Maurice Jeanneret.

Revue des revues (1916).

W. P. MUSTARD.

BRIEF MENTION.

R. G. K.: *Historical Grammar of the Ancient Persian Language,* by EDWIN LEE JOHNSON, Ph. D. New York, *American Book Co.,* 1917. Pp. xiv+251. Price $2. This convenient handbook is Vol. VIII of the Vanderbilt Oriental Series, edited by Tolman and Stevenson, and assuredly fills an empty space in the apparatus of the Iranian scholar, though like most such handbooks it is substantially only a methodical summary and arrangement of work already done and scattered in the various periodicals. It contains brief accounts of the decipherment of the inscriptions, of their location and publication, of ancient Persian writing and pronunciation, and of the Indo-European languages; then follows an historical account of the development of the Indo-European sounds and paradigms into the Ancient Persian, and a brief treatment of the syntax of Ancient Persian, with one or two excursuses on other features.

When we compare JOHNSON's volume with Meillet's *Grammaire du vieux perse* (1915), we observe that JOHNSON starts from the Indo-European sound or form, and traces down to Ancient Persian, while Meillet makes the Ancient Persian his point of departure. For etymological comparisons and studies, one finds Johnson's work the more usable; but Meillet enters into a mass of detail which the more careful worker may not disregard, and which he will not find in JOHNSON's volume. This is astonishing in view of the fact that the two books are of substantially the same bulk; but the Vanderbilt scholar uses his space in giving a fairly complete abstract of Indo-European and of Aryan and Iranian philology, on which to base his Ancient Persian interpretations. This would obviously be a proper method, if the Ancient Persian were a language with an abundant vocabulary and entire paradigms exemplified in the remains. But it is very meager in both respects, and JOHNSON's procedure is very extravagant of space, often hiding the Ancient Persian needle in an Indo-European or Aryan haystack. For instance, after over five pages on sandhi and vowel contraction, in which not a single Ancient Persian example is found, the contraction of vowels in Ancient Persian is disposed of in half a page, including six Persian examples. Two full pages are used on the pronoun of the second person, though only three Ancient Persian forms are found; the irrelevant matter fills exactly one page of the two. Twelve pages on the Indo-European personal endings of verbs, with their develop-

ment into Indo-Iranian, are followed by four and a half pages on the personal endings of Ancient Persian; why devote three pages of the twelve to dual endings, when Ancient Persian contains not a single specimen of a verb in the dual number? It is a pity to load up a really good and convenient handbook with so much useless lumber: for even the author hardly expects it to be used as a general reference work on Indo-European processes and forms.

There are naturally points of detail where the reviewer would differ, but he refrains from devoting to such use the space at his disposal. The volume is, despite the superfluous material, a welcome complement to the convenient volumes already issued on Ancient Persian in the same series.

———

R. G. K.: *Graeco-Persian Names,* by ALVIN H. M. STONE-CIPHER. (New York, *American Book Co.,* 1918. Price $1. The Vanderbilt Oriental Series, vol. ix), gives still further testimony to the scholarly productivity which one enthusiastic teacher may evoke in a little-frequented field of knowledge. This volume should be in the library of every classical scholar who has to do with Persian personal names appearing in Greek texts. Justi's *Iranische Eigennamen* is not very usable, both from its arrangement and from its date, and Professor Stone-cipher's volume is a convenient successor, with the material carefully arranged. The classical writings for Persian names are listed in comparison with the known or presumable Persian forms; the graphic representations in Greek of the several Persian sounds are tabulated; the etymological elements of the Persian names, with their meanings, are catalogued, with lists of the names into which they enter. Thus almost any linguistic information that may be desired with regard to the names is readily available in such form as to be most useful to teachers of the classics as well as to professed etymologists and to comparative philologists.

———

C. W. P.: In his *Latin Diminution of Adjectives,* reprinted from *Classical Philology* (XI, 426f., XII, 49f.), Professor Walter Petersen has made a collection and classification of Latin diminutive adjectives for the special purpose of investigating those that denote an approximation to the quality of the primitive adjective, a meaning usually translated in English by the suffix *-ish* or by placing the word 'somewhat' or 'rather' before the adjective. These so-called diminutives of quality

differ in meaning from the great mass of diminutive adjectives in Latin, i. e., those which by enallage transfer to the nouns they modify the notions of small size, endearment, or contempt, implied in their diminutive endings. To this latter class belong many diminutive adjectives which the lexicons erroneously translate by means of ' somewhat '. The idea of approximation to the primitive adjectives is found in three classes of adjectives: (1) diminutives of adjectives denoting a large size or quantity, which starting from the diminutive notion of smallness developed a meaning exactly like that of dim. of quality, e. g., *grandiculus* ' rather large ', *longulus* ' rather long '; (2) dim. of adjectives signifying color and of one denoting taste, *acidulus;* and (3) comparative adjectives in -(i)*usculus* (=comp. *-ius+* dim. *-culus*). Whence arose this notion of approximation to the primitive adjective? So far as the dim. ending -(u)*lus* is concerned, it must have developed on Latin soil, for the Indo-European suffix *-lo-* did not have it. But I. E. *-ko-* did have this force, and, according to Brugmann, *-ko-* is the first part of the Latin suffix *-culus.* Hence in adjectives of the third class, all of which end in *-culus,* it was inherited from I. E. *-ko-.* Those of the first class, as explained above, got this meaning from the notion of small size. In regard to the second class which is composed of color adjectives and *acidulus,* all ending in *-lus* with one possible exception, the author holds that either some link must be found to connect these with adjectives of large size, or else the two Latin suffixes -(u)*lus* and *-culus* had come to have the same meaning in prehistoric times, the notion of approximation to the primitive adj. thus passing over from *-culus* to -(u)*lus;* and he then decides in favor of the latter alternative.

K. F. S.: Index verborum quae in Senecae fabulis necnon in Octavia praetexta reperiuntur. A Guilielmo Abbott Oldfather, Arthuro Stanley Pease, Howardo Vernon Canter confectus. Pars prior. Apud Universitatem Illinoiensem MDCCCCXVIII. Pp. 103. $2.00. (University of Illinois Studies in Language and Literature. Vol. IV, May, 1918, No. 1.) As a conscientious reviewer I felt that I ought to test the correctness of this index by looking up all the examples under a few words selected at random. I found no false references. But even if I had done so, I am not sure that I should have mentioned them here. Men who are at once competent and willing to make such an index as this of any great classical author deserve all the encouragement and support that the world of scholarship can give them. Hitherto

the only index verborum of Seneca's plays was in the Lemaire edition. It was incomplete according to modern standards, it was also out of print and not generally available. This new index is well printed, correct and complete. As soon as it is finished we shall have entire command of a series of dramas important not only in themselves but also because they are practically all that is left of what was once a large and important department of Roman poetry.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

Thanks are due to Messrs. G. E. Stechert & Co., 151–155 W. 25th St., New York, for material furnished.

AMERICAN AND ENGLISH.

Andrelinus, Publius Faustus, and Arnolletus, Joannes. Eclogues; ed. by W. P. Mustard. (Studies in the Renaissance Pastoral, 3.) Baltimore, *Johns Hopkins Press*, 1918. 123 pp., 8°, $1.50 net.

Bowman (H. Newpher). The Crimes of the Oedipodean Cycle. Boston, *Badger*, 1918 (Badger's Classical Studies). 62 pp., 12°, $1 net.

Brownlee (Mrs. Louisa Alberta Griffin). Helois, amicus humani generis; a four act play; an adaptation from the Greek and Roman mythology. Seattle, Wash., *Dearborn Pr. Co.*, 1917. 10 + 68 pp., il. pls. por., 8°.

Buck (C. D.) Studies in Greek Noun-formation: Dental Terminations, I. *Camb. Univ. Pr.*, May, 1918. 50 pp., Ryl. 8°, 2s. net.

Caesar (Caius Julius). Commentaries; the Gallic War, bks. I–IV, with selections from bks. V–VII and from the Civil War; with an introd., notes, a companion to Caesar and a vocabulary by F. W. Kelsey. Boston, *Allyn & Bacon*, 1918. 40 + 137 pp., il. col. pls. maps, 12°, $1.50 net.

Flickinger (Roy Caston). The Greek Theater and its Drama. Chicago, *University of Chicago Press*, 1918. 28 + 358 pp., il. pls. figs. map plan, 8°, $3 net.

Gauvain (Auguste). The Greek Question; tr. by Carroll N. Brown; pub. for the American-Hellenic Soc. (Am.-Hellenic Soc. Pubs. I.) New York, *Oxford Univ. Press*, 1918. 11 + 107 pp., 12°, pap.. $2 per year; not sold separately.

Greek Anthology (The). With English trans. by. W. R. Paton. (In 5 vols.) Vols. 4 and 5. (Loeb Classical Lib.) *Heinemann*, July, 1918. Pp. 422, 412, 18°, ea. 6s. net; lthr., 7s. 6d. net.

Homer, The Odyssey. Done into English prose by S. H. Butcher and A. Lang. New ed. *Macmillan*, June, 1918. 452 pp., 8°, 10s. net.

Hopkinson (Leslie White). Greek Leaders; under the editorship of W. Scott Ferguson. Boston, *Houghton Mifflin*, 1918. 7 + 259 pp., 12°, $1.

Juvenal and Persius. With English trans. by G. G. Ramsay. (Loeb Classical Lib.) *Heinemann*, July, 1918. 498 pp., 18°, 6s. net; leather, 7s. 6d. net.

Kallen (Horace Meyer). The Book of Job as a Greek Tragedy Restored; with an introductory essay on the original form and philosophic meaning of Job; and an introd. by G. Foot Moore. New York, *Moffat, Yard & Co.*, 1918. 12 + 163 pp., 12°, $1.25 net.

Leeder (S. H.) Modern Sons of the Pharaohs: a study of the manners and customs of the Copts of Egypt. Illus. *Hodder & S.*, June 1918. 371 pp., 8°, 16s. net.

Messer (W. Stuart). The Dream in Homer and Greek Tragedy. (Columbia Univ. Studies in Classical Philology.) New York, *Lemcke & Buechner*. 8 + 105 pp., 8°, $1.25 net.

Plautus (T. Maccius). Menaechmi. Ed., w. intro. and notes, by P. Thoresby Jones. (Oxford Classical Texts.) *Milford*, June, 1918. 286 pp., 8°, 4s. 6d.

Plutarch, Select Essays; tr. with introd. by A. O. Prickard. New York, *Oxford Univ. Pr.,* 1918. (Oxford lib. of translations.) 19 + 336 pp., 12°, $1.50 net.

Royds (Thomas Fletcher). The Beasts, Birds and Bees of Virgil: a naturalist's handbook to the Georgics. 2d ed., rev. *Blackwell,* June, 1918. 126 pp., 8°, 4s. 6d. net.

—— Virgil and Isaiah: a study of the Pollio, w. translations, notes and appendices. *Blackwell,* June, 1918. 135 pp., 8°, 5s. net.

Suetonius Tranquillus (C.) De vita Caesarum libri 1–2; Iulius, Augustus; with introd. and notes by J. Howell Westcott and Edn. Moore Rankin. Boston, *Allyn & Bacon,* 1918. (College Latin Ser.) 54 + 373 pp., 12°, $1.60.

Thirlmere (Rowland). Diogenes at Athens, and other poems. *Selwyn & B.,* June, 1918. 128 pp., 8°, 3s. 6d. net.

Thucydides. The Funeral Oration Spoken by Pericles. From the Second Book of Thucydides. Englished by Thomas Hobbes of Malmesbury. (Sheldonian Ser.) *Blackwell,* June, 1918. 30 pp., 8°, 2s. 6d. net.

Virgil, Aeneid VI. Ed. by C. E. Freeman. (Oxford Jr. Latin Ser.) *Milford,* June, 1918. 160 pp., 8°, 1s. 9d.

White (H. J.) Select Passages from Josephus, Tacitus, Suetonius, Dio Cassius. Illustrative of Christianity in the First Century. (Texts for Students Ser.) *S. P. C. K.,* May, 1918. 16 pp., 3d. net.

Xenophon, Hellenica. Bks. 1–5. With English trans. by Carleton L. Brownson. (Loeb Classical Lib.) *Heinemann,* July, 1918. 507 pp., 18°, 6s. net; leather, 7s. 6d. net.

FRENCH AND ITALIAN.

Anglade (J.) Grammaire élémentaire de l'ancien français. Paris, 1918. Unbd., 92 c.

—— Les Troubadours. Leurs vies, leurs oeuvres, leur influence. Paris, 1918. Unbd., 92 c.

Bué (Henri). First Steps in French Idioms. Paris, 1918. Boards, about 60 c.

Dauzats (Albert). Les argots de métiers franco-provençaux. 8°, 268 pp. Paris, 1918. (Part 223 of the Bibliothèque de l'École des Hautes Études.) Unbound, $2.40.

Delcourt (Joseph). A Shakespeare Primer for the Use of French Schools. (Classes de 6ème, 5ème, 4ème, et 3ème.) Paris, 1918. Boards, $1.20.

Ducros (Jean). Le Retour de la poésie française à l'antiquité grecque au milieu du xixème Siècle. Paris, 1918. Unbd., 60 c.

Gondry (Lieut.) French and English Artillery Technical Vocabulary. Spécialement destiné aux officiers d'artillerie détachés dans les armées anglaise et américaine. 140 pp. Paris, 1918. Unbound, $1.

Guarnerio (P. E.) Fonologia romanza. 1918. XXIV, 642 pp., bd., $2.60.

Guyon (B.) Grammatica Teorico-pratica della lingua Slovena. 2 ed. 1918. 343 pp., bd., $1.20.

McLaughlin (J.) A graduated "cours de versions" being a selection of French texts for the use of schools and private students. Paris, *Garnier,* 1918. Boards, about $1.

Nicod (L.) Texte critique, avec introduction, notes et glossaire de: Les Partures Adam, les jeux partis d'Adam de la Halle. Paris, 1918. Unbd., $1.45.

Pernot (Hubert). Recueil de textes en grec usuel, avec traduction française, notes et remarques étymologiques. Paris, *Garnier*, 1918. Boards, about $1.

Sperandeo (P. G.) La lingua russa. Grammatica ed esercizi con la pronuncia figurata, contenente più di 3000 vocabuli della lingua parlata con le flessioni irregolari, una scelta di prose e poesie, un frasario. 4 ed., 1917. 274 pp., bound, 90 c.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

Allen (James Turney). The Key to the Reconstruction of the Fifth-century Theater at Athens. Berkeley, *University of California Press*. (Reprinted from Univ. of Cal. Publications in Class. Philology, Vol. 5, No. 2, pp. 55-58, May 18, 1918.)

Arkiv för nordisk filologi. Trettiofjärde bandet. Ny följd. Trettionde bandet. Lund, *C. W. K. Gleerup*, 1918.

Bennett (Charles E.) New Latin Grammar. Third Edition. Boston, New York, Chicago, *Allyn and Bacon*, 1918.

Bruce (Harold Lawton). Voltaire on the English Stage. (University of California Publications in Modern Philology, Vol. 8, No. 1, pp. 1-152.) Berkeley, *University of California Press*, 1918.

Burton (Ernest De Witt). Spirit, Soul, and Flesh. Historical and Linguistic Studies in Literature Related to the New Testament, Second Series, Vol. III. Chicago, *University of Chicago Press*, 1918.

Callaway (Morgan, Jr.) Studies in the Syntax of the Lindisfarne Gospels, with Appendices on Some Idioms in the Germanic Languages. (Hesperia, Supplementary Series: Studies in English Philology, edited by J. W. Bright, No. 5.) Baltimore, *Johns Hopkins Press*, 1918.

Cudworth (Warren H.) The Odes and Secular Hymn of Horace. Englished into Rimed Verse Corresponding to the Original Meters. New York, *Alfred A. Knopf*, 1917. $1.50 net.

Dennison (Walter). A Gold Treasure of the Late Roman Period. University of Michigan Studies, Humanistic Series, Vol. XII, Part II. New York, *The Macmillan Co.*, 1918. $2.50 net.

Flickinger (Roy C.) The Greek Theater and its Drama. Chicago, *University of Chicago Press*, 1918. $3.00 net; postage extra; weight 44 oz.

Hart (Walter Morris). Kipling the Story-writer. Berkeley, *University of California Press*, 1918.

Hewitt (Theodore Brown). Paul Gerhardt as a Hymn Writer and his Influence on English Hymnody. New Haven, *Yale University Press*; London, *Humphrey Milford*, 1918.

Hrdlička (Aleš). Recent Discoveries Attributed to Early Man in America. Smithsonian Institution, Bureau of American Ethnology, Bulletin 66. Washington, *Government Printing Office*, 1918.

Inter-America. A Monthly Magazine. English: Vol. I, No. 5, June, 1918. Español: Vol. II, Núm. 2, Julio de 1918. New York, *Doubleday, Page & Co.*

Mnemosyne. Nova Series. Vol. XLVI, Pars II. Lugduni-Batavorum, *E. J. Brill;* Lipsiae, *O. Harrassowitz*, 1918.

Modern Language Notes, Vol. XXXIII, No. 6, June, 1918. Baltimore, *Johns Hopkins Press.*

Peppler (Charles W.) Comic Terminations in Aristophanes. Part IV. (Reprinted from the American Journal of Philology. Vol. XXXIX, 2.)

Pilling (James Constantine). Bibliography of the Eskimo Language. Washington, *Government Printing Office*, 1887. Smithsonian Institution, Bureau of Ethnology.

—— Bibliography of the Siouan Languages. Washington, *Government Printing Office*, 1887. Smithsonian Institution, Bureau of Ethnology.

Powell (J. W.) Philology, or The Science of Activities Designed for Expression. (Extract from the Twentieth Annual Report of the Bureau of American Ethnology.) Washington, *Government Printing Office*, 1903.

Sanders (Henry A.) The Washington Manuscript of The Epistles of Paul. The New Testament Manuscripts in the Freer Collection, Part II. New York, *The Macmillan Co.*, 1918. $1.25 net.

Shakespeare (The Yale). The Tragedy of Macbeth. Edited by Charlton M. Lewis. New Haven, *Yale University Press*, 1918.

Studies in Philology, Vol. XV, No. 2, April, 1918. Chapel Hill, *University of North Carolina.*

—— Vol. XV, No. 3, July, 1918. Death and Liffe: An Alliterative Poem. Ed. with Introduction and Notes by J. H. Hanford and J. M. Steadman, Jr. Chapel Hill, *University of North Carolina.*

Universidad de la Habana. Revista de la Facultad de Letras y Ciencias. Vol. XXVI, Núm. 1, Enero y Febrero de 1918. Habana, Imprenta "El Siglo XX".

University of Illinois Studies in Language and Literature. Vol. IV, No. 2, May, 1918. Index Verborum Quae in Senecae Fabulis necnon in Octavia Praetexta Reperiuntur. A. Guilielmo Abbott Oldfather, Arthuro Stanley Pease, Howardo Vernon Canter Confectus. Part 1. Urbana, *University of Illinois.* Price $2.00.

Van Leeuwen (J., J. F.) Enchiridium dictionis epicae. Editio altera aucta et emendata. Lugduni Batavorum, *A. W. Sijthoff's Uitgever-smaatschappij*, 1918. fl. 6.50.